THE

AMERICAN

CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

REVIEW.

BC

VOLUME I.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1876.

PHILADELPHIA:
HARDY AND MAHONY,
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS,
505 CHESTNUT STREET.

COPYRIGHT, 1876,

BY

HARDY AND MAHONY.

70734

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

Salutatory. i

Anti-Catholic Prejudice. By *Right Rev. James O'Connor, D.D.*, . . 5

Nature and effects of prejudice, 5; Anti-Catholic prejudice, 6; Its unreasonableness, 7–11; Its credulity, 12; Excesses to which it has led, 13; Its dangers, 15; Remedies for removing prejudice, 15; General Grant's speech at Des Moines, 17; Catholic parades, 19; The necessity of prudence, 21.

The Philosophy of the Supernatural. By *O. A. Brownson, LL.D.*, 22

The nature and value of true philosophy, 22; The philosophy of the supernatural, 23; Disbelief in the supernatural, and its cause, 24; How it may be removed, 25; The reality of the supernatural, its relation to the natural, 27; The principle of rational science, 29; The principle of theology, or supernatural philosophy, 30; Its relation, 30; The incarnation in its relation to supernatural philosophy, 30; The unity of the natural and supernatural, 31.

The Classical Education of the Day. By *Right Rev. T. A. Becker, D.D.*, ... 33

The object of the article, 33; The importance of classical studies, 34; Deficiencies of American graduates, 34; The causes for these deficiencies, 35; Incompetent teachers, 40; "Cheap and easy" roads to learning, 41, 42; Boat races and other college sports, 45; American professors, 48; Their ignorance and incompetence, 49; Patent defects in American Colleges, the remedy, 48–50.

The Jesuits. By *Very Rev. James A. Corcoran, D.D*, ... 51

The prayer of St. Ignatius, 51; John Quincy Adams and the Inquisition (note), 52; Persecution of the Jesuits, 52, 53; The spiritual exercises, 54; Evangelical counsels, 57; The Reformation—the "Emancipation of the flesh," 59–62; The Jesuit vow of obedience, 62; The Jesuit and his superior, 63; The true nature and value of obedience, 63–65; Ecclesiastical dignities (note), 65; Reasonableness of obedience, 66; Limits of the Jesuit's vow, 68; Crimes not sanctioned, 69; Ranke's statement, 70; Its disingenuousness, 70; The meaning of the phrase, "*Obligare ad mortale,*" 71; The consolation of the Jesuits, 73.

The Bugbear of Vaticanism. By *Rev. Edward McGlynn, D.D.*, . . 73

Old bugbears losing their power, 73; Catholic doctrines defended by Protestants, 74; Mr. Gladstone's accusations, 74; Their character, 75; The human element in the Church, 77; The Church and the world, 78–80; The cry of "Divided allegiance," 83; The Pagan Cæsars, 84; The mediæval empire, 85; The modern German empire, 86; The so-called "Equality of men," as connected with our rights and our duties, 87; The "Subjective conscience and the objective law," 89; The discussion of the questions involved, 91; The nature of the Church and its teaching authority, 93; Peter's office, 94; The deposit of faith, 96; The Pope the custodian of the moral order, 97; In what manner he defines the law, 98; The Pope and the deposition of sovereigns, 98; The advantages of American liberty, 99; Testimony of Pope Gregory XVI, 99.

The Divinity of Christ. By *Right Rev. P. N. Lynch, D.D.*, ... 100

Vital importance of the subject, 101; Christ the soul of Christianity, 101; The early attacks on his divinity, 102; The attacks in the eighteenth century, 102; The modern method, 103; Protestant inability to meet these attacks, 104; Science and religion, 106; The position of Catholics, 106; The relation of the Church to Sacred Scripture, and how the true interpretation of texts of Scripture can be determined, 107; Statements of the adversaries of Christianity, 111; Doctrine of the Jewish Rabbis, 112; What Christ says of Himself, 113–117; The character of His statements, 117; An objection answered, 117; "The Son of God:" explanation of this expression, 118; The oriental mind *vs.* the western mind, 119; Nature of Sonship, 121; Reasons for Christ's words, 125; The Patripassians, 125; Further testimony, 125.

PAGE

Modern Physicists and the Origin of Man. By *George Dering Wolff*, ... 126

The hostility of modern physicists to Christianity, 126; Their method of investigation, 127; Uncertainty of scientific conclusions, 128; Prof. Tyndall on the supernatural, 130; And on religion, 132; Professor Tyndall's theories, 133–135; His admissions, 136; Researches of Father Thebaud, 139; Two propositions explained and proved, 140; The primitive condition of man, 143; His primeval barbarism disproved, 144; The dispersion of mankind, 146.

The Catholic Church in American History. By *John Gilmary Shea*, ... 148

Catholics the first explorers of America, 149; The Spaniards in Florida, 149; The French in Canada, 150; The missionary journeys, 150; Catholics in Maryland, 150; And in the other colonies, 151–153; France in the valley of the Ohio, 153; The English conquer Canada, 153; American Catholics and the revolutionary struggle, 154; The Catholics in 1783, 155; Bishop Carroll, 156; A half century of progress, 157; Anti-Catholic agitation, 158; State proselytism, 159; The education question, 159; The Public School Society, 160; The Bible question, 161; The German emigration, 161; The Native American Party, 161; The Philadelphia riots of 1844, 162; Religious orders in America, 163; Catholics in office, 163; Catholic authors, 164; The Indian Missions, 165, 166; Catholics and the civil war, 167; Results of the war, 168; President Grant and the proposed amendment, 168, 169; Present position and strength of the Catholic Church in America, 170; Examples of virtue and sanctity, 172; The Church's inherent vitality, 173; Her future in America, 173.

Actual Situation of the Church. By *Rev. Aug. J. Thebaud, S.J.*, 193

The mission of the Church, 194; A beautiful symbol, 194; The formation of Christendom, 195; The position of the Popes, 197; The idea of the Church, 198, 199; The great teacher, 200; The judge of men and institutions, 202; The great tribunal, 204; Feudalism and war, 206; The Church the avenger and consoler, 207; The Church and the poor, 210; The principles of Wycliffe, 212–215; Their spread, 216–218; Applied in modern times, 219; Attack on the Papal States, 220; Napoleon III and Victor Emmanual, 221–224; Garibaldi in Italy, 225; The canonization of Japanese Martyrs, 225; The entry of the Italians into Rome, 227; The unity of Italy, 229; Italy and the Pope, 230.

Shall we have a University? By *Right Rev. T. A. Becker, D.D.*, . 230

The necessity of improving the higher education, 230; Position of Catholics in regard to education, 231; Catholic Colleges, 233; Need of a Catholic University, 235; Increase in the number of Catholics, 237; Their educational wants, 238; Advantages of a University, 239; Dr. Newman's opinion, 241; Action of the Council of Baltimore, 242; Feasibility of establishing a University, 244; Examples from the past, 245; It is a work of time, 246; Qualifications of the Professors, 247; and of the students, 250; The difficulties not insuperable, 252.

The Inquisition. *J. G. S.*, ... 254

The question of religious coercion, 254; The ancient belief, 255; The modern theory, 255; The Albigenses, 258; Foundation of the Inquisition, 259; The Inquisition and the Jews, 261; Protestant intolerance, 262; The Spanish Inquisition, 263; Llorente's account, 265; The Jews in Spain, 266; The Moors, 267; The terrible ravages of the reformers, 268; The Inquisition checks them, 268; It becomes a state engine, 268; And persecutes the Jesuits, 269; Method of the Inquisition, 270; Autos de Fe, 271; The numbers who perished, 272; Severity of penal codes, 273; Protestant misrepresentations, 275; Catholic writers, 276.

Secular Education in England and the United States. By *T. W. M. Marshall, LL.D.*, ... 278

Teaching an essential function of the Church, 278; The project of secular education, 279; The secularist and the sectary, 280; Excellence of Catholic schools, 281; Protestant testimony, 282–285; The attacks of modern science, 286, 287; Authority, the defence of mental freedom, 288; The proposed divorce of religion and education, 289; Education no preventive of crime, 290; The so-called religious difference in education, 291; State education in France, 292; In Germany, 293; The condition of religion in Germany, 294–296; And of Russia, 296–298; The American common schools, 298; Testimony as to their effects, 299; Dr. Edson, 300; M. Tremenheere, 301; Mr. Mann, 302; Evils of secularism, 303, 304; Advantages of Catholic education, 305; President Grant's speech, 307; A question, 309; The Church and the world, 310; A beautiful vision, 311.

Rambles in the Rocky Mountains. By *General John Gibbon, U.S.A.*, 312

The discoveries of Captains Lewis and Clarke, 312; The valley of the Yellowstone, 313; A journey up the valley, 314; The beauties of the valley, 316; The terraces and the cap of liberty, 318; The hot springs, 319; Their wonders, 321; The frozen cascade, 322; The "bee-hive," 325; Down the valley, 327; difficulties of western travel, 328; Falls of Gardner's River, 330; A bridge on the Yellowstone, 331; A magnificent view, 333; A mud volcano, 335.

PAGE

MIRACULOUS POWERS IN THE TRUE CHURCH. By *Very Rev. James A. Corcoran, D.D.*, ... 337

Miracles and prayer, 337; The prayer test, 338; Mr. Buckley on miracles, 340; The Purpose of miracles, 341; Miracles under the old law, 342; Their object and purpose various, 344; The conversion of Europe, 346; Miracles wrought in its conversion, 347; Miracles may still be performed, 348; But the reformers wrought none, 350; Nor protestant missionaries, 351; Wesley on Miracles, 352.

GENERAL BANKS AS A HISTORIAN. By *M. F. S.*, ... 353

The position of General Banks, 353; His statements on the elective principle, 354; Political principles in the Old Testament, 354; No democracy among the Jews, 355; Nor among their neighbors, 357; Assyrian government, 358; Government of Persia, 361; and of India and China, 362; The Grecian states, 363; Mr. Gladstone on Homer, 365; Character of the Greek Republics, 368; Researches into chronology, 370; General Banks on the Pope and King Pepin, 370; Parke Godwin and Gibbon on this case, 371; The facts of the case, 373; The Church and the equality of man, 374; The Church and governments, 375.

THE ITALIAN OCCUPATION OF THE CITY OF ROME. By *Rev. Henry Formby*, ... 385

The manner in which Christ identified himself with the world, 386; The consequences of this, 387; The position of the old Roman Empire in history, 388, 389; And of the city of Rome, 390; The occupation of the city of Rome by the Italians, 392; The apathy with which this is regarded, 393; And the reason for it, 396–399; The history of Rome as viewed by Protestants, 399–401; The Catholic significance of Roman history, 401; Babel as the centre of revolt, 401; Is destroyed, 401; Rome as the centre of faith and truth, 402; Our duty to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, 403.

CATHOLIC INDIANS IN MICHIGAN AND WISCONSIN. By *Rev. Edward Jacker*, ... 404

The permanence of the Jesuit missions, 405; The Indians on Lake Huron in 1660, 407; The tribes and their numbers, 408–410; Dacotas, Ojibwas, and Ottawas, 410–412; The French missionaries, 413; Their travels and sufferings, 414; Fathers Menard and Bruga, 414, 415; Father Claude Alloez, 416; His journeys, 417–419; Father James Marquette, 419; Mission of La Pointe, 421; Father Druillettes, 423; Jesuits at Sault St. Marie, 425; Green Bay mission, 425; The Isle of Mackinaw, 427; Bishop Fenwick's visit, 432; Modern Algonquin mission, 435.

THE ORIGIN OF IDEAS. By *Rev. Walter H. Hill, S.J.*, ... 436

Theories on the origin of ideas, 436; Statement of the question, 438; The scholastic method the most reasonable, 439; Illustrated by their theory of vision, 440–445; The action of the intellect in apprehending, 445–447; An objection stated and answered, 447; The real difficulty of philosophical inquiries, 448; Theories to explain this, 448; The scholastic theory, 449; Proofs that this theory is true, 451–453; The present state of the question, 454.

RAMBLES IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS. By *General John Gibbon, U. S. A.*, 455

En route for the falls, 455; its branches, 456; Mud geysers, 459; An eruption, 461; Secondary shores, 462; A group of hot springs, 463; Their peculiarities, 465, 466; Lake Madison, 467; Upper geyser basin, 468; The National Park, 471; A magnificent spectacle, 473; Sketch of the discovery of the Yellowstone region, 474.

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST. By *Right Rev. P. N. Lynch, D.D.*, . . . 475

Christianity the greatest of facts, 475; Christ its central point, 476; The unity and unchangeableness of the Church, 477; Changes in modes of speech, 478; The teaching of the Apostles respecting Christ's divinity, 481; Their accounts of Him, 482; And of His death, 485; St. John's gospel, 486; The "Word of God," 487; Meaning of the phrase in literature and philosophy, 487–492; St. John's statements analyzed, 492–495; Passages in the Epistles explained, 495–500; The meaning of the word figure, 501; A survey of the whole argument, 503.

THE CHURCH AND THE INTELLECTUAL WORLD. By *Rev. Aug. J. Thebaud, S.J.*, ... 504

Modern intellectualism, 504; Terms offered to the Church, 505; The Church as an intellectual body, 506; The Augustan age, 508; The new ecclesiastical literature, 508; The school of Alexandria, 510; Origen, 511; The Greek fathers, 512; The Scriptures, 513; The Latin writers, 514; Syriac, 515; Armenia, 516; The Church as the creator and guide of nations, 517; Influence of the clergy, 518; The Church and the Christian people, 519; The formation of languages, 520; Universities founded, 522; Europe in the 18th century, 523; Effects of the Reformation, 524; Freemasonry, 526; The Church and education, 529; Education in France, 529–531; The modern conflict, 532; Resources of the Church, 535; A hopeful prospect, 537.

PAGE

HOMERIC TROY: ITS SITE AND REMAINS. By *Prof. F. A. Paley*, . . . 539

Discoveries of Dr. Schliemann, 539; The site of Troy, 539; Is Hissarlik the site of Homer's Troy? 541; Difficulties of this theory, 543; Was Troy a real city? 546–548; The curious balls of clay, 549; What they are, 550; Dr. Schliemann's conjectures, 551, 552; The rude art of Hissarlik, 553; Dr. Schliemann has proved nothing, 555; Mr. Gladstone's opinion, 557; The historic character of the Iliad an open question, 559.

IN MEMORIAM: ORESTES A. BROWNSON. By *The Editor*, ... 560

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE. By *Rev. Aug. Thebaud, S.J.*, ... 577

The Church and the people, 577; Love of the people for the Church, 579; The causes of the alienation of the working classes in France, 583; Evils of the mediæval period, 584; Feudalism and want of comfort, 586; Slanders on the monks, 589; Nature of civilization, 591; Principles of the middle ages on politics, 592; Its social principles, 594; Principles of liberalism as regards politics, 596; Socialistic theories, 600; Attacks upon the Church, 602; Axioms of the French atheists, 604; The Anti-Christian movement, 606; The Catholic position, 607; Misunderstanding of the real character of the French people, 609; The French people really religious, 610; The reason why modern socialists endeavor to destroy, in the French working classes, belief in the immortality of the soul, 611.

WHAT THE CHURCH AND THE POPES HAVE DONE FOR THE SCIENCE OF GEOGRAPHY. By *John Gilmary Shea*, ... 612

The mission of the Church, 612; Geography during the first ages, 613; The Church encourages scriptural geography, 615; Geographical knowledge in Rome, 616; Missionaries increase geographical knowledge, 617; The crusades and their influence in advancing the science of geography, 619; Geographical progress in the fifteenth century, 621; Cosmography of Pope Pius II, 622; The voyages of Christopher Columbus, 623; American explorers, 625; Globes and mural maps of the Popes, 627; Jesuits and priests as cosmographers, 630; They explore America, 633; The amount of information gathered, 634.

THE PAST AND THE PRESENT INDISSOLUBLY UNITED IN RELIGION. By *Rev. Henry Formby*, ... 635

The growth of the New World, 636; Aim of modern statesmanship, 637; Designs of God in our day, 638; Past associations and present dangers, 642; Knowledge of God presupposed in the preaching of the gospel, 644; Two props of the anti-Christian cause—first, modern statesmen, 646; Then modern scientists, 648; Design of Father Thebaud's work, 649; God's "treasure" and gift, 651; Antagonism of modern science to religion, 652; Value of Father Thebaud's work to Christians in this conflict, 653; Reasons for the confusion of languages and the dispersion of mankind, 654; Collateral subjects still remain for discussion, 655.

A PLAN FOR THE PROPOSED CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY. By *Right Rev. T. A. Becker, D.D.*, ... 655

Deficiencies of schools and colleges, 656; Plan for the proposed building, 658; The corporators, 659; The endowment, 661; The faculties and professors, 663; Deficiencies of so-called graduates, 665; Urgent plea for a change, 666; Suggestions as to the professors, 667; The German system, 668; The completeness of the lecture system in Germany, 668; Examination of professors, 669; When and how a professor should be removed, 670; Examination of students—how it should be conducted, and what it should comprise, 670–673; Discipline of the students, 674; How instruction should be given, 674, 675; Other suggestions, 675, 676; Importance of the subject, 677–679.

THE NINE DAYS' QUEEN. *S. M.*, ... 680

Absence of the heroic in English royalty, 680; Lady Jane Grey, 681; Her talents unknown to her contemporaries, 682; Her parents, 684; Charles Brandon, his character of Lady Jane Grey, 686; Her early days, 686; Her associates, 688; Terrible death of Henry VIII, 691; Subsequent events, 692; Death of Catharine Parr, 694; Jane Grey in Seymour's care, 697; Bucer, 697; Seymour's execution, 698; Latimer's character of Seymour, 698; Aylmer and Ascham, 699; Lady Jane's letters, 701; Her marriage, 703; Her dislike of her husband's parents, and want of affection for him, 704; Death of Edward VI, 705; Lady Jane's reign, 706; Her death, 710.

WHO IS TO BLAME FOR THE LITTLE BIG HORN DISASTER? By *Rev. Edward Jacker*, ... 712

Custer's defeat, 712; Our Indian policy, 713; The Dacotas, 714; Their first visitors, 716; Father Menard on Lake Superior, 718; The war of the Dacotas and the Hurons, 719; Father Allooez and the Dacotas, 724; Massacre of Dacota envoys, 728; Jesuit efforts to open a mission, 730; First mission, 732; Linguistic appendix, 739.

HOW SHALL WE MEET THE SCIENTIFIC HERESIES OF THE DAY? By *X. C. S. P.*, ... 741

Guizot's misrepresentations, 743; Balmes' refutation of them, 744; Variety of method and harmony of belief, 745; History of European philosophy, 746; Necessity for the cultivation of natural sciences, 748; Modern needs and the remedy, 750; The strength of the religious position, 751; The scientific infidelity of the day, 752.

BOOK NOTICES.

Adventures of a Protestant in Search of a Religion 188
Alzog's Manual of Universal Church History, 377
Allies' Formation of Christendom 567
Acolyte, The 575
American State and Statesmen 768

Brute, Memoirs of Bishop 767

Confession, Segur's 181
Ceremonial for the Use of the Catholic Church in America 184
Catholicity, Evidences of 187
Chesnel's Les droits de Dieu et les Idees Modernes 381
Catholic Church and Christian State 569
Coleridge's Life of our Life 574
Catholic Church in the United States, History of 765
Cortes' Essays 768

Darwiniana, Fisher's 764

England, Lingard's History of 191
Essays 768

Freemasonry; its Secret Warfare Against Church and State 571
Franciscan Missions 766
Fourier's Theory 768

Ghost, Holy, The Internal Mission of the 174
Graduale de Tempore et de Sanctis 188
Gentilism, Thebaud's 189
Gospels, Exposition of. By Bishop McEvilly.. 759
Geographies, Mitchell's 761
Geographies, Sadliers 762
Geographies, O'Shea's 763

Haven's Ancient and Modern Philosophy 378

John, St., Life of the Apostle 179
Jesus, Heart of, Devotion to the 192
Jenkins', O. T., Handbook of British and American Literature 384
Jesus Christ, Union with Our Lord 576

Kenrick's Primacy of the Apostolic See 574
Key of Heaven 575

Lavelle's, Madame de, Bequest 189

Miscellanea 187
Meditations, New Practical 190
Mathilda of Canossa 380

Newman's, Dr., Characteristics 382

Officium Parvum Beatæ Mariæ Virginis 182

Principia, a Basis of Social Science 570
Painting, Schools and Masters of 764
Puritan Revolution 767

Rituale Romanum 186
Reformation, History of the Protestant 187
Reader, Young Ladies' Progressive 576
Real Life 576
Roper, Margaret; or, the Chancellor and His Daughter 576

Saints, Lives of the 183
Seigneret, Life and Letters of Paul 185
Spalding's Archbishop's Miscellanea 187
Sin and Its Consequences 190
Sacred Heart, New Manual of 191
Sisters of Mercy, Little Companion of the 191
Sacred Heart, Glories of 572

Talmud, Selections from the 756
Thomas, St., of Canterbury 768
Terra Incognita; or Convents of the United Kingdom 573
Two Thousand Years After 768

Vesperale Romanum 188

Wiseman's, Cardinal, Essays 177

Yoland of Groningen 380

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. I. JANUARY, 1876. No. 1.

SALUTATORY.

OUR REVIEW, as its name points out, is to be Catholic and American. Its aim, therefore, will be to explain and defend the Catholic theory of revealed Truth, moral and dogmatic, as it really is, as it has been left us by the Apostles and defined by the Church; and to let men see how different is the base counterfeit of the same, wickedly forged to our discredit by some, and received in good faith as our doctrine by many others outside of our communion. It shall be our endeavor also to show the practical development and working of Catholic principle in the history of the world, in the lives of great and good men, and in the destinies of nations. In the history of mankind before and after the establishment of God's Church on earth, we recognize no chaotic mass of events huddled together like Lucretian atoms by blind chance, or produced merely by the caprices and passions of men. We look upon it as a great book in which the true philosopher as well as the devout Christian may trace on every page the finger of Divine Providence. In it we find, as all must who study and reflect dispassionately, the perpetual presence and action of God, who moulds men and things at His will; calls into being, guides, preserves or destroys kingdoms and peoples for His own wise purposes; in a word, makes of nations, as well as of individuals, either trophies of his mercy, or standing memorials of His avenging justice.

In the days of old, when God was known only in Judah, and His name was not great outside of Israel, He abode quietly in Salem; and the Church of Sion was simply the depository of His revelation, the treasure-house in which were silently laid up the hopes of humanity. But the Church of the New Law has a more active mission; and hence in the history of the world, since the days of Christ, she is seen perpetually foremost as God's visible agent in bringing peoples to the knowledge of divine truth; in renewing, or to speak more correctly, creating afresh their moral life; in educating and civilizing them, in improving and bettering their condition in all that concerns their intellectual and moral welfare. Whatever there yet remains of good and creditable in the civilization of Europe is the work of her hands, the legacy she has bequeathed to ungrateful states and kingdoms. Even now, buffeted and persecuted as she is in Europe, stripped of all earthly influence and humbled to the very dust by infidel statesmen—it is simply the moral power of her presence that prevents European society from taking the final plunge into the anarchy and barbarism, for which three centuries have been striving to prepare it. And in spite of many, who may be disposed to deny or doubt or sneer at our conviction, we feel assured, and have no hesitation in saying that our own country—if it is to be saved from the deluge of irreligion and immorality that is gradually threatening to submerge people and government—can only be saved by the influence of Christianity, as it is preached by the True Church of Christ. No paltry sects, born of human caprice, and, true to their origin, bending with all the whims and changes of human opinion, can ever succeed in drawing back our people from the abyss to which they are hurrying. Nothing can save us but the true Christian Creed, the only one in the world which has the boldness to teach our countrymen, in word and deed, that we are freemen not in name only, but that the freedom given us by Christ is our inalienable heritage with which we must not part; that neither the State nor Public Opinion is our lord and master, nor has either a right to command us in the moral, any more than in the intellectual sphere; that it is as unlawful for them to usurp power not their own, as it was for George III. and his Parliament; in short, that neither the State nor Public Opinion is the God of the true Christian, but that if either sets itself up against God and His Christ—as every modern State and the Public Opinion of our day seems mostly disposed to do—it becomes simply an engine of Satan for the destruction of souls, and the ruin of the commonwealth.

Some portion of our pages will be devoted to philosophy and science. True philosophy is, in some sense, the creation of Christianity. Nothing else could have purified the old Greek philosophy of its dross, superstition and skepticism, and confirmed by a divine unerring standard the old truths that primitive tradition had transmitted more or less distinctly to successive ages. All right-minded men may see what philosophy has become, ever since it shook off the guardianship of True Religion. From Bacon and Descartes there has been a logical successson of false teachers down to Kant, Fichte and Schelling, to whom we may add those bold-faced dogmatists, Büchner, Tyndall, Huxley, Darwin, etc. The road is easy enough from mild skepticism down to Pantheism, Atheism and Nihilism.

Science has ever been, when not lifted out of its proper sphere, the willing handmaid of religion; and this for the simple, evident reason that truth being one can never contradict herself. Just before the outbreak of the so-called Reformation, the Catholic Church condemned the assertion that anything can be true in theology, which is false in philosophy. And to that teaching she still adheres. The sects may go down and perish before the advances of science "falsely so called." They have this much in common, that both are born of private judgment, the fallibility of which is made a boast of by sectarians. But the infallible Church of God, besides her consciousness of divine origin, knows too that her Author is the same who gave laws to nature—"*qui omnia in mensura et numero et pondere disposuit*" (Wisdom xi. 21), and that His undivided sway rules all worlds, material and spiritual. Hence she looks undismayed upon the pretended science, born of heresy, that, while scouting her claims, pretends likewise to dethrone her Divine Founder. She may well afford to laugh at their pretensions, when she remembers that whatever constitutes the foundation of European science is due to her own fostering care; and that to her children the world owes all the important discoveries that have been made, from the starry pathways of heaven down to that dread amalgam, in which "villainous saltpetre" holds no little part, and which forms one of the chief elements of our boasted modern civilization.

With politics, as they are commonly understood, and partisan contentions for place and power, the REVIEW has nothing to do. It little concerns us, who sits in the Presidential chair once hallowed by George Washington, or rules in the Cabinet, or has the dispensing of the patronage that outflows from the seat of government to enrich, not unfrequently to corrupt, our citizens. But we love our country, and we deprecate the sad contingency, that, while she improves in material prosperity, she should go backward in the path of honesty and equity, and give to the world the lamentable example of a commonwealth so changed and depraved by a hundred years' growth, that her founders, were they to return to earth, would not recognize her for the work of their hands. How could we be indifferent, nor give some expression to the shame and sorrow that we feel, in beholding daily more and more verified amongst our statesmen those terrible words of the prophet, "Thy princes are faithless, the companions of thieves; they all love bribes, they run after rewards." (Isaiah i. 23.)

Our REVIEW is not only Catholic, but American. Hence we shall endeavor to chronicle and illustrate whatever is worthy of preservation, whether it be matter of history or tradition, in the origin and progress of the Catholic Church in America. But it is also American in another sense. Whilst defending the creed of our Catholic countrymen before the world, and doing what we can to gather up for their love and veneration what yet remains unknown or only partially told of the apostles and founders of the faith in our land, we shall not forget the duty that we owe to our non-Catholic countrymen. There are among them some few, who, embittered by the wicked spirit of sectarianism, do not wish to know the truth, and who, like the Scribes and Pharisees with whom our Saviour had to deal, hated and detested the truth the more, in proportion as they felt its presence and power growing manifest before their eyes. To such men of course we cannot appeal for a hearing. But there is a large class of our non-Catholic countrymen, who are ignorant of Catholic doctrine through no fault of their own, but simply through the chances of birth and education. They have an inherent love of justice and truth, a spirit of religion, though misdirected by unhappy training. They dislike and condemn us, because they know us only, not as we are, but as we have been falsely presented to their view. If they knew us better, if they could but see the Catholic religion as it really came from the hand of its Author, the Church of Christ in her true colors, no longer disfigured by the hideous visage and distorted features, wherewith heresy has chosen to paint her for the last three centuries, her comely and venerable aspect would awaken in them love and admiration. With such we propose to follow the example of the great Augustine, who said in a similar case, "Sanari eos potius, si fieri potest, quam oppugnari, volo."

Our contributors have no common bond, other than that of loyalty to the Church and devotion to her cause, and that likewise of Catholic charity, which as the Apostle says (1 Cor. xiii. 3, 4) "*patiens est, benigna est, non agit perperam, non irritatur, non cogitat malum.*" Hence they are free to speak their own individual sentiments on all matters that do not infringe Catholic unity, according to the good old saying: "*In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas.*" But above all, they will ever bear in mind the closing words of the same maxim, "*In omnibus charitas.*"

We are not without misgivings, either as to the arduous nature, or the probable success of our undertaking. We wish that some consciousness of power might enable us to say with the Roman Orator, "*neque illud ipsum, quod est optimum, desperandum est; et in præstantibus rebus magna sunt ea, quae sunt optimis proxima.*" But at least we may say with the Umbrian poet:

> "*In magnis et voluisse sat est.*"

ANTI-CATHOLIC PREJUDICE.

PREJUDICE, as popularly understood, may be said to be a habit of the mind, inclining it to judge favorably or unfavorably of men and things, without due, or at least full deliberation. It has its seat in our emotional nature, in the feelings, the will, not in the in-intellect. It is not evil in itself, but only in its culpable excess or misdirection. Inclining us to pre-judge, to judge hastily and without deliberation, as a matter of course, it very often makes us judge erroneously. All men are, more or less, under its influence, for all have feelings and passions. We are all naturally, and, we might say, necessarily prejudiced in favor of the good and the true, and against the bad and the false; but as hasty, inconsiderate or unenlightened judgments often lead us to mistake the one for the other, we, in point of fact, and in the concrete, not unfrequently reject what is true, believing it to be false, and accept what is false, believing it to be true.

Who has not felt the force of this habit? Who has not known its delusions? Who has not had cause to bewail them? It makes it very hard for us to judge impartially of whatever is near and dear to us. It often closes our eyes to the faults of our friends, and the virtues of our enemies. There is no object of our love or dislike, in regard to which it may not mislead us. But, of all kinds of prejudice, that inspired by religion, or, to speak correctly, by religious error, is the most blinding, the most deep-seated and the most lasting. In other matters prejudice gives to the mind a bias, more or less marked; in this, it can stimulate it to the most unreasoning fanaticism. And the reason is to be found, not alone in the paramount issues suggested by religious thought, but also in the delusions practiced upon us, in that sphere, by the enemy of souls.

Prejudice is popularly supposed to be stronger in the ignorant than in the educated. This, however, is a mistake. Unaided by divine grace, the most cultivated minds are as much under its influence, as the most illiterate. The educated, indeed, may be superior to many of the coarser prejudices of the vulgar, but they take up others quite as strong, and, often, more hurtful to themselves and to others.

But it is not our purpose here to attempt a psychological disquisition on the nature and effects of prejudice in general, but only to make some reflections on that particular phase of it manifested by non-Catholics against the Church. This anti-Catholic prejudice is, decidedly, one of the salient facts of the present and of past times, and as such, deserves the calmest investigation of all thinking men.

We shall speak of it plainly, but, we hope, dispassionately, taking care to avoid, in our own case, what we shall have to blame in others.

No one needs to be told that there exists in this country, a wide spread feeling of opposition to the Catholic Church. Of this fact we are made but too painfully aware, every day of our lives. The merchant encounters it in his place of business, the mechanic in his workshop, even the servant girl in her kitchen. It is a fruitful source of misunderstanding and estrangement between Protestant and Catholic neighbors. It embitters their enmities, casts a shadow over their friendships. Most of us, no doubt, can number amongst our Protestant acquaintance, some one or more esteemed friends. But, we generally find, that no matter how sincere their friendship, it rarely diminishes their prejudice against our faith. They may esteem us, but they feel an inward shrinking from our creed. Regard for our feelings may make them avoid the discussion of religious topics, but not on that account are they the less convinced that Catholicity is a tissue of errors and superstitions, or that it is certain in the end to bring mental darkness and moral blight on the land that professes it.

Our literature is anti-Catholic. There is hardly a standard work on history, or popular science, or general literature, known to American readers, which, where it touches on Catholic subjects, does not purposely or unintentionally misrepresent us. The same is true of our books of travel, our poets, and our writers of romance. The majority of our magazines and reviews are bitterly hostile to us, and those that are not, are more or less unfriendly and unfair. The most we dare hope for from our political newspaper press, is that it let us alone; but we know full well it allows few occasions to pass of circulating slanders against us. And then, there is the Protestant religious press which sends forth annually hundreds of thousands and millions of papers and pamphlets and books, the great majority of which are designed to carry hatred and horror of Catholicity into every homestead in the land, and into every cabin on the remotest frontier.

In theory, our federal, and with, we believe, one exception, our state constitutions, favor no particular denomination. In theory our legislation is free and impartial, and place and political preferment are accessible to all, regardless of creed. But has not anti-Catholic prejudice frequently sought, and often obtained legislation adverse to our interests and insulting to our feelings? Where on this wide continent is the place in which a man's Catholicity would not be found to be a serious obstacle in the way of his political advancement? We all remember how, some years ago, the election to the Presidency of an otherwise most popular candidate was considered impossible, till he permitted a denial of his faith to be made for him by his friends. The defeat of Mr. Kernan, in the election for governor in the State of New York three years ago; the opposition to Mr. Carroll, in Maryland, and to other Catholic candidates for office elsewhere during the last elections, are more recent cases in point.

In all the states of the Union, Protestant literary and charitable institutions received, in times past, generous support from our legislatures. We are not aware that appropriations thus given, were ever known to shock the public sentiment of Protestants, or to elicit complaint even from Catholics. But have not the few applications made for government aid by Catholic hospitals and orphan asylums, been so many signals for public outcries against us? As for Catholic colleges, they have never at any period of our history that we have heard of, thought it worth while even to ask for a single dollar of public money. In some instances they have found it very difficult to obtain even a charter.

Now, we consider this anti-Catholic prejudice one of the strangest, one of the most unaccountable facts in the history of human thought. Prejudice, indeed, in one form or other, has existed from the beginning, and will continue to the end of time. But never has a prejudice so opposed to truth, so devoid of justifiable motive, so utterly groundless, gained an influence over as many intelligent minds, and held that influence as long, as that felt by Protestants against the Church.

In the first place, Protestants, as a general rule, know little or nothing of our doctrines. They may, and no doubt do, understand the doctrines they hold in common with us; but the Catholic doctrines they controvert, against which they protest, they do not understand. We do not say that no Protestants understand them, but that the great mass of Protestants do not. Nay more, we assert that they misknow them, are grossly misinformed and misled in regard to them. Now, who are to be the judges in this matter? Who are to say whether or not Protestants are correctly informed in regard to our faith? Most assuredly we Catholics. The members of every religious society must be presumed to be the best witnesses to the faith they profess. Episcopalians very properly claim to understand and know the Thirty-nine Articles of their religion better than Presbyterians, and Presbyterians claim to know what is contained in their professions of faith better than Episcopalians. But what is our experience as to the knowledge Protestants have of our doctrines? Precisely that which we have stated. The vast majority of them know little or nothing about them, and are grossly misinformed concerning them. We hardly ever meet a Protestant who has ever read a Catholic book, or even a Catholic catechism. We hardly ever find a Catholic book, or a Catholic paper, in a Protestant house. We occasionally meet with a Protestant who has read the Book of Mormon, who can discourse learnedly and accurately of ancient and modern systems of philosophy, of Mohammedanism, or of Buddhism; but a Protestant who is correctly informed in regard to a single one of the Catholic dogmas against which he protests, we seldom or never meet. This is a *fact*, to which all Catholics can bear witness.

We never take up a Protestant book, or pamphlet, or newspaper, in which allusion is made to Catholicity, that we are not tempted to cast it from us as a libel on our faith. Thus, for instance, all Protestants who write or preach against the Church take it for granted that she sanctions superstition, that Catholics pay to the Blessed Virgin, the saints, and even relics, an honor due only to God. Now, we know, and who should better know, that every Catholic child is taught to abhor superstition, in all its forms, and that Catholics would shrink from the very thought of paying the slightest act of divine honor to the Blessed Virgin, much less to the other saints, or to relics. Protestants tell us that the Catholic doctrine in regard to confession encourages the commission of sin. Were it what they immagine it to be, it would no doubt do so. Rightly understood, we know it to be eminently calculated to produce, and that in point of fact it does produce the directly contrary effect. They say our priests sell indulgences to commit sin. We can only reply that this is a monstrous untruth. They tell us Catholics are not allowed to read the Bible, though it is well known that a Bible is to be found in nearly every Catholic house. Nothing is plainer in history, than that the Church has been the most constant, the most zealous, and the most munificent friend and patron of education, the world has yet seen. Nevertheles, the great majority of non-Catholics are persuaded that a cardinal point in her policy has always been to oppose and check intellectual culture of every kind. She has put no restraint on human thought, or action, which God himself has not imposed upon them. She has suffered much in the defence of popular rights against the tyranny of rulers, and of legitimate authority against rebellion. The freest forms of government on earth have her blessing, and the cordial support of her children; yet non-Catholics, generally, know her only as the uncompromising advocate of despotism in every form.

And thus we might go over the whole catalogue of Protestant popular objections to the Church, and assert that they are based on false suppositions, that they spring from misconception and misrepresentation of her doctrine and her discipline.

Nor is it in theological works only, that false charges of this kind occur. They are to be met with in every description of Protestant writings, from the dictionary to the encyclopedia, from the school primer to the grave and philosophical history. The candidate for collegiate honors finds them in his Whateley's Rhetoric and Logic. The student of law finds them in his Blackstone; the man of letters in all the sources of his literary and scientific knowledge. Even Mr. Bancroft, though he frankly confesses that Catholics were the first to give religious liberty a home—"its only home, in the wide world"—on this continent, has, unconsciously we trust, woven into the beautiful web of his History of the United States, more than one coarse anti-Catholic calumny.[1]

The following passage from Dr. Nevin, an eminent Protestant clergyman of this State, confirms what has thus far been said on this subject. "We are all familiar," he says, "with the anti-popery spirit under this radical and fanatical form. Our common religious press may be said to teem with it every week. It meets us on the street, and in all public places. Our very piety is infected with it to a large extent, both in the sanctuary and in the domestic circle. The fountains of our charity are turned by it too often into wormwood and gall. Many appear to look upon it as one main part of their religion, a necessary evidence of their evangelical temper and habit, to hate and curse the Catholics. However it may be in any other direction, here, at least, they feel that they do well, as it would seem, to be angry, to show contempt, and to indulge misrepresentations and abuse to their hearts' content. Nicknames are so pat to the tongue, that they flow from it like the poison of asps, without effort or thought; all, too, in Christ's sweet and holy name. The most abominable charges and criminations are trumpeted without proof, as though the bold repetition of them simply were enough in the end to make them good. No pains are taken to understand any doctrine or practice of the Church in the light of its own historical or theological relations; it is counted quite sufficient to drag every article, in the most rude and vulgar way, before the tribunal of the world's common sense (alas, how *common* in many cases,) and to take the measure of its merits accordingly, as though the deepest mysteries of religion might be settled by such superficial and profane judgment, as it were, at a moment's glance. All runs out easily, thus, into the most wholesale censure and reproach. Romanism is found to be from beginning to end a tissue of impiety and folly, at war with the most sacred interests of humanity, and in full contradiction to the will of God. It is a diabolical conspiracy against truth and righteousness. There is no reason in any of its institutions; they are founded on falsehood throughout; they subvert the whole sense of the Gospel, and, in their source and operation, are purely anti-Christian, of one order, we may say, with infidelity itself. Such, in general, is this popular theory." (*Mercersburg Review*, 1852, page 45.)

During the last political campaign in Ohio, Bishop Rosecrans, through the columns of the *Columbian*, offered "a handsome picture" to every man in his diocese, "who could find a newspaper attack on the Catholic Church without a misrepresentation in it." Need we say that thus far no claimant has appeared for one such gift?

And how can Protestants have other than erroneous ideas of Catholicity, if, from whatever cause, they never read our books or our formularies of faith, and are dependent for their knowledge of it on those who misrepresent it? Some years ago, we received a letter from a Protestant young man in the State of Ohio, who, as he said, had been "taught to look with abhorrence on the Catholic religion and its adherents," and who had learned the lesson taught him. Subsequently, however, his reading of history led him to conceive such a dislike of Protestantism, and such a veneration for the Church, as to make him feel that, in his own words, he "must either become a firm believer in the Mother Church, or a disbeliever in Christianity." "Can you," he asked, "will you give me some advice? Are there no books, papers, tracts, or other publications, that will enlighten me in regard to your religion?" In a subsequent letter, he said: "In all I have ever read, I have never found a single page, nay, not even a sentence, favorable to Catholicism, or rather intended as such. It has been one continued tirade of abuse, and all I know about the Romish Church, is through her enemies." Now, there are hundreds of thousands and millions of non-Catholics in this country, who, like this young man, have been taught to abhor the Church, but who, unlike him, have hardly ever suspected that an imposition has been practiced upon them.

And is there not something truly extraordinary, something preternatural, in this ignorance, this utter delusion, in regard to our faith? We can understand how the Pagans could have been led to believe that the early Christians adored an ass's head, and, at their love feasts, fed on the flesh of babes. There was a secrecy and a mystery about the assemblies of those first Christians. Pagans, and even catechumens, were not allowed to be present at them, nor to read nor see the Sacred Scriptures. This secrecy might have easily given color to the calumnies that were circulated against the faithful. But the Church has now no *Arcanum*. Her temples are open to all. All have access to her formularies of faith. Protestants live, everywhere, intermingled with Catholics, from whom they may learn our doctrines. Almost everywhere may be found Catholic books and Catholic papers. Yet, strange to say, even in cities where nearly half the population is Catholic, Protestants are as profoundly ignorant of our faith as in the most Protestant districts. How strange, how unaccountable this is! Protestants explore every department of science, read history, criticise it, philosophize upon it; but of the Catholic Church, the only fact that has filled the world, and filled it for nineteen centuries—a Church whose history is the history of civilization, a Church that has converted and civilized all the great nations of the world—of her they know nothing that is true, and will believe nothing that is good! Impartial critics in all things else, they accept, with a blind and blinding faith, their ideas of her from her bitterest foes, and do not and will not hear what she has to say in her own defense.

All this might be intelligible if Protestants ignored the Church, if they were accustomed to banish the thought of her from their minds. But they do nothing of the kind. She is the bugbear of their childhood, the crafty enemy of their liberties in manhood, the great moral and social evil against which it is the duty and the endeavour of their whole lives to contend. They will talk about her, write about her, they will do anything and everything but study and understand her. Is this, we ask, complimentary to their intelligence, their fairness, their love of justice?

Contrast their conduct, in this respect, with that of Catholics. Where, in the long list of our standard controversialists, is there one in whom can be found the slightest misrepresentation or misstatement of the errors they undertake to refute? Who, for instance, would suspect a Bellarmine, a Swartz, a Bossuet, or, coming down to present times, an England, a Wiseman, a Newman, or a Manning, to be even capable of such a thing? Why, it is notorious that such a charge is hardly ever made against Catholic writers or preachers, even of the most ordinary intelligence. And when it is, where is the writer or preacher who is not only too glad to correct the error into which he may have unintentionally fallen? Could such a one be found, Catholics would be the first to lose respect for him. They would not tolerate him in their pulpits, and they would pray to be delivered from such a defender of their faith. And as for libelous charges on any class of non-Catholics, clerical or lay, from the Catholic press or pulpit, who has ever heard of them? Sometimes, indeed, attention is called by some of our papers to such current scandals among non-Catholics as may be said to have become public property; but in this they are not sustained by the approval of the general Catholic reader. Unless in the case of some notorious hypocrite, who has become "a corruptor of the flock," or something of that kind, and whom for this reason it becomes necessary in the interest of public morals to expose, Catholics regard such mention of their neighbors' faults as a violation, if not of charity, at least of propriety and good taste.

We do not claim for Catholics generally a critical knowledge of Protestant doctrine, much less of the history of its all but endless variations. As well might they be expected to be conversant with the *Flora* and *Fauna* of the different Protestant countries, as with the specific doctrinal differences of the countless sects to which they have given birth, during the last three centuries. Still all intelligent Catholics are correctly and sufficiently well informed as to the general principles of Protestantism, its leading objections to Catholic dogma and discipline, and the principal arguments by which it seeks to sustain them. To give them such information is a part of their Catholic training. It is to be found in the doctrinal catechisms they study as children, and in the numberless tracts and books on popular controversy, in the hands of persons of all ages and conditions amongst us.

But be their knowledge on these points what it may, certain it is that the most unenlightened Catholic would think it literally a sin and a shame, as well as a folly, to attribute to Protestants errors they do not hold, and which they even condemn and reprobate.

But anti-Catholic prejudice is not only unenlightened, misled; it is also credulous in the extreme. It accepts without inquiry and without hesitation the most extraordinary stories about convents and the Catholic clergy; and no sooner is one such calumny exposed, than it welcomes others as improbable, or more improbable than the preceding. It craves aliment of this kind just as the drunkard craves rum. It is true, Protestants here no longer believe that priests have horns. They have seen too many of them to believe that now. They will hardly suffer to be told any more, as they used to be told even within our recollection, that the Pope meditates a descent on this continent, and the capture of Washington city. But they can still be made to believe, or at least to suspect, very strange things about us. We once heard a Protestant clergyman tell a large and enlightened audience in this State that the young ladies of St. Joseph's Academy, Emmetsburg, were made to adore the wooden image of a lamb, in Holy Week, and the statement was generally credited in the community where it was made. The same gentleman gave as illustrations of the religious belief of the Irish people, the story of St. Patrick and the snake which he shut up in an iron chest, and other stories of the same kind, from the "Killarney Legends." We are forbidden, under pain of excommunication, to become members of secret societies; yet it would be hard to convince the majority of Protestants that there is not a very flourishing society of the kind in the Catholic Church, under the lead and control of the ubiquitous Jesuits.

How many a good Protestant lady has heard from her pulpit, and read in her religious weekly, that her servant Bridget is a committee of one from this society to report the affairs of the family to the priest, who, in turn, will report to the bishop, whose duty it will be to lay the whole matter before the Pope!

To pander to this grosser kind of anti-Catholic credulity, was, for a long time, quite a profitable business in this country. It gave notoriety and a livelihood to numberless impostors, from Maria Monk to Miss Bunkley, from Hogan to Leahy, Achilli, and others of later date. And though the charges made by these wretched anti-popery celebrities have been refuted to the satisfaction even of candid Protestants, and though some of the traducers have themselves made humble and open confession of their falsehood, their libels may still be found for sale on the shelves of Protestant bookstores.

Of a large class of Protestants, it can hardly be said, that they "rejoice not in iniquity," at least when we are supposed to be its authors. When chronicling our misdeeds, few of them can be likened to those

> "Who, sad as angels for the good man's sin,
> Weep to record, and blush to give it in."

Quite the contrary. Losing sight of the first principles of Christian charity where we are concerned, they are jubilant over the wickedness imputed to us; and, when we are proven to be less guilty than had been supposed, they give no uncertain signs of disappointment and chagrin: their press and pulpit, that echoed the calumny against us and exulted in it, are silent, and dream not of repairing the injury done us.

This anti-Catholic prejudice has, more than once, hurried Protestants into excesses of which Protestants themselves were often ashamed. It made men, calling themselves Protestants, set a torch to Mount Benedict near Boston, to the churches of St. Augustine and St. Michael in this city, and to the churches and homes of Catholics in other places. It made them shoot down unoffending Catholics in the streets of Louisville, Kentucky, and forçe them back to perish in their burning dwellings set on fire by an anti-Catholic mob. Others it led to tar and feather a priest in Maine, for no other crime than that of being a priest. And in polite, learned and liberty-loving Massachusetts, it sent an investigating committee of legislators, very properly styled at the time "a smelling committee," to pry into the cupboards and cellars and sinks of a convent boarding house, in search of captive or murdered females.

About the same time this convent-phobia, which is ever lurking in the system of Protestants, showed itself in a very malignant form in our city. A ladies' petition was gotten up here in

1851, to the Legislature of Pennsylvania, calling for the suppression of nunneries, under the gross insinuation of their being only seats of licentiousness and sin. "Strange 'ladies' they must have been," says the Protestant Dr. Nevin, already quoted, "that could lend their names to such an infamous libel on the purity of their own sex. The like insult directed towards the Episcopalians, Methodists or Presbyterians, would have at once drawn upon itself the angry frown of society as a breach of all decency as well as charity. But, as directed against the *Catholics* only, the blackguardism of the thing was generally not felt. Certain "evangelical" papers caught up, even with a great gusto, as a capital hit, the flying report that the legislature had referred the petition to the Committee on Vice and Immorality. Now, if *any* ground had ever been given for scandal, in the history of American nunneries, one might have some patience with such ribald ruffianism, hiding its malignity under the cloak of religion. But what well-informed person needs to be told that every apology of this sort is wanting? All attempts yet made to blast the good name of these institutions amongst us, have recoiled with signal discomfiture on the heads of those who have acted as leaders in the vile crusade. It is enough to refer to Charlestown, Pittsburgh and Montreal, to the *memory* of Miss Reed, Dr. Brownlee and Maria Monk. On the other hand, the good works of these religious houses have been too manifold and plain, in every direction, to be rationally called in question. Now, in all seriousness, we ask what right, in these circumstances, have people pretending to be themselves respectable and pious, to vilify and calumniate the inmates of such institutions, in the way of which we now speak, as though they had forfeited all claim to the most ordinary courtesies of well-bred life? Just as little right, we say confidently, as any gentlewoman has to outrage, in the same way, any ladies' seminary whatever, in the land." (Mercersburg Review, 1851, page 475.

That the spirit that inspired this petition survived it, is evident from the fact that, five years ago, another effort was made in our legislature to have a visiting committee appointed for our convents. There must be, at least, fifty thousand Protestant ladies in the United States who have been educated in our convents, and who bear witness to the purity and the piety of their inmates; but their testimony is not sufficient to silence the nasty insinuations of anti-popery bigots.

About the same time that the ladies' petition so fittingly commented on by Dr. Nevin was drawn up, a crusade was preached in this city against Catholic servant girls, several of whom were turned into the streets simply because they were Catholics.

Thousands of Protestants, it is true, deplored these excesses, and did what they could to atone for them; but were they not the natural effects of the false and outrageous charges made against us by the non-Catholic press, and the non-Catholic pulpit? No one need be surprised at them. The wonder is, that they have not been more frequent, and more violent. Were a tithe of what Protestants are taught to believe of us true, the Latter-day Saints would be saints indeed, compared with us. Did we really hold the doctrines, and entertain the designs for which they give us credit, Protestants, to be consistent and just to themselves and the country, should drive us into the sea.

And what happened before, may easily happen again. Where there is so much combustible material, a spark may cause a conflagration at any moment. A well-concocted tale of scandal about a convent, a Catholic hospital or orphan asylum; an imprudent act an imprudent utterance by a bishop or a priest; an injudicious article in a Catholic paper; any false step, in fine, made by one or more representative Catholics, so-called, might stir up as fierce an excitement to-day as ever disgraced the past. It is of course unreasonable, outrageous, to hold the Catholic community responsible for the sins or indiscretions of its individual members, but such is the logic, and such the justice of anti-Catholic prejudice.

But how are we to meet this prejudice of non-Catholics? Two rules of conduct in regard to it must commend themselves to everybody. One is, not to give it any unnecessary occasion of irritation; the other, to do all in our power to enlighten it.

We may not conceal or explain away Catholic truth, in any one particular; but we can proclaim and defend it, without giving reasonable cause of offence to any man. To assert and uphold our rights under the constitution and the laws, is our privilege, and may sometimes become a duty. But, may not the case arise, too, when to do so persistently, clamorously, or even to do so at all, would be both impolitic and mischievous?

There is in this country a large class, larger perhaps than in any other, of fair-minded non-Catholics who would not knowingly, do us a wrong even in thought. At times, too, and in particular localities, they have been able to give practical proof of their love of justice and fair play, even when we were concerned. Still we cannot always rely on the support of this class, when a grievance is to be removed, or a just claim to be advanced. Least of all can we do so, in seasons of religious excitement. At such times, those who inspire and direct anti-Catholic opinion, know very well how by well-timed misrepresentations, to array many of them against us, to awe others into silence, and to defy the remainder. But we should bear in mind that there is another class who, when we have shown them in what and how they can harm us, are only too glad to profit by the knowledge we give them. When we prove to unscrupulous opponents of this sort that, for instance, a certain provision of law is unjust and injurious to us, we give them the very strongest reason for insisting on its maintenance; and should they be led to regard it as fatal to any important Catholic interest, they are excited to a frenzy of zeal in its defense. Press and pulpit, secret societies and associations of every kind, are summoned to its support; all the bad passions bigotry can arouse are let loose, and very often the evil originally complained of is supplemented by others much harder to bear. When this is likely to be the result of pressing any Catholic claim on the attention of the general public—and such a result should, generally speaking, be anticipated whenever we have to touch some deep-seated, cherished delusion in the public mind—it were, we submit, better not to press it. Any good to be hoped for by so doing, had better be sought by other means. Prudence is a virtue, and one without which the other virtues must degenerate into vices. "All things are lawful to me, but not all are expedient." We all have a right to protection in life and limb, but a sensible man will be careful how he crosses the whim of a lunatic. Now, every community goes mad at times, on a variety of subjects; but we venture to say there is no subject on which the non-Catholic mind is as liable to lose its balance, as on that of Catholicity. And when it is lost, there are never wanting those who are able and willing to put method in the madness that ensues, whether for the shedding of Catholic blood, the destruction of Catholic property, or the passing of laws hostile and hurtful to Catholics. Such men and their dupes are not restrained by any considerations of right or justice. Their only recognition of these virtues is, to do in their name the very worst deeds. No matter how consistent in other respects, they will fling consistency to the winds, they will even sacrifice their most cherished principles, to do us a wrong. The enemies of the Church are ever and always the same, animated by the same spirit, guided by the same policy. The advocates, *par excellence*, of religious liberty, Protestants, have never granted it to Catholics, or indeed to each other, when they had the power to withhold it, and have meekly taken their Gospel from the state whenever the state was willing to adopt them as its own, and give them the benefit of its support and protection. The ultra Radicals, and the advanced Lutherans of Prussia, are to-day, the most enthusiastic supporters of Bismarckian rule. Freely, joyfully, do they give their feet to the fetters forged by this tyrant, solely because they think them likely to prove more galling to their Catholic fellow-countrymen than to themselves. In the Catholic states of Germany, the Radicals who control them would rather see them absorbed by Prussia, than continue to be Catholic, showing thereby that their hatred of the Church is much stronger than even their love of country.

Let us not be deceived. Our enemies in this country lack only the power to do here, what Bismarck and his friends are trying to do against us in Europe; and should the power be given them, they will do it in a more summary and shameless manner than their European models. Such a trifling obstacle as a clause in the Constitution, they will not allow to stand in their way for a single moment. Here they profess to be in favor of the separation of church and state; but do we not find them making constant efforts—in which they are but too often successful—to use the legislative power of the state and federal governments to strengthen their own position and undermine ours? Their protestations to the contrary notwithstanding, the sects and modern infidel parties have an innate sense of their own weakness. They feel their inability to hold their own against each other, but especially against the Church, without the aid in one form or other of the civil authority. Hence they have always sought to usurp that authority, or when that was impracticable, to make it as far as possible subservient to their ends. This is all perfectly natural. When men cut loose from the religious order established by God in the world, they cannot feel the ground very firm under their feet, and they must be expected to catch at such helps for support as lie within their reach. The secret societies and the sects have evidently made up their minds that the time has come for pressing this government into their service, in the general onslaught they are now making upon the Church, and we may rest assured they will leave nothing untried to effect their purpose. If they fail, it will not be their fault. And why may they not succeed? In these days of "culture," all that is necessary to make a law, to make wrong right or right wrong, is a majority of votes; and that majority secured, what is there that the enemies of the Church need be afraid to dare or do, even in a republic? Has not the anti-Catholic legislation of Switzerland, during the past year, cast even the Falck laws into the shade? and has not every outrage committed against religious liberty, whether at Berlin, or Berne, or Geneva, the approval, more or less avowed of all classes of non-Catholics in this country?

The outline of the crusade with which we are threatened was given us by General Grant in his maiden speech at Des Moines, a few months ago. It is eminently Bismarckian. From a literary point of view, that speech can hardly be said to be a success. As it reflected the inner thought and temper of the man, it was a deliverance disgraceful in the chief magistrate of a great nation, and especially so in one who ought to be animated by the high impulses of a soldier, and of a soldier of the United

States Army. But it derives great importance from the fact that it has been deemed quite sufficient, not only to restore the lost popularity of its author, but to retrieve the fortunes of a falling party. After what has transpired since it was spoken, who is prepared to say that its influence has been over-estimated? One thing at least seems certain: should General Grant actually commit himself to the course of action foreshadowed in that speech, though he may be disappointed in the hope he is said to entertain of a third term, he cannot fail to become the leader and the idol of a very powerful party in this country. He is not a great man. Even his former admirers have generally ceased to regard him as such. He may without injustice be classed with those modern "Presidents of Republics," who, as Louis Veuillot has lately said, rise up like phantoms to betray the needs of the public, who are weighed and found wanting, who are lost in oblivion, and who, if they have chanced to leave any footprints after them, a sort of dust soon blows over them, and obliterates their fruitless tracks. Still, his shortcomings, whatever they may be, if not forgotten, will be condoned him, and he will become the *Magnus Apollo* of ultra-Protestantism and radicalism in the United States, should he lend the prestige of his name and the patronage of his office to further the "policy" indicated in his speech. And, should he adopt this course, no one will be able to plead in his defence that he did so out of the superabundance of his religious enthusiasm. Religious enthusiasm is about the last thing of which anybody could suspect Mr. Grant capable. He may have, and no doubt he has, the ordinary amount of bigotry imbibed by non-Catholics from their tenderest years, but he is not, and never was an enthusiast. No, should he put himself at the head of an anti-Catholic crusade, he will do so with all the cool calculation of that worst class of politicians, who are always ready to make use of religious fanaticism to secure or retain place, and to be used by it in turn.

Should a persecution be forced upon us, as would seem not unlikely to be the case, we need of course have no fears for the Church; and as for ourselves, we must hope that God will give us grace to bear it. But we must not provoke it by culpable indiscretion on our part. To do so would be to tempt God. A little less boasting than we are accustomed to indulge in about our numbers and our influence, to say nothing of the imprudence of the thing, would, it seems to us, be in better taste. Catholic parades and processions are all very well in Catholic countries There, they strengthen faith and Catholic feeling in those who take part in them, and in those who witness them. Here, in our opinion, they are out of place. They put unwelcome obstructions in the way of public business and when they do not exasperate, they certainly do not edify a community that can have no sympathy with them. The enemy is ever on the alert to compromise us, to put us in a false position; and such demonstrations furnish numerous occasions of doing so, especially if they lead, as they may at any time lead, to a violation of the peace. Years ago we heard a prominent clergyman of this city say, that in his opinion the anti-Catholic feeling that culminated here in the riots of 1844, had received its first great impulse from a Catholic procession that paraded our streets in 1839. Our estimable Temperance and Beneficial Societies, or at least many of their members, may not, we fear, like this disapproval of displays which they view in a very different light from us. But we feel the general sentiment, not only of the country, but of Catholics, is opposed to them; and even though it were not, we should for the reasons just mentioned consider it a duty to enter our protest against them at the present time. We do not flatter ourselves that our words are likely to have much effect in putting a stop to them, but we are unwilling by our silence to be held in any way accountable for the shedding of blood they are likely some day to occasion. Catholics are accustomed to rely, and in this country they have always solely relied on the law and the constituted authorities for protection in person and property. They have no organizations for self-defence against those whom they know to be hostile to them, and ready to do their worst against them should the opportunity offer. This under ordinary circumstances is as it should be. But how is it with those whom they would find opposed to them in case of riot, or disorder? Every large city and town in the land is, we need hardly say, covered with a network of secret societies, which though with one or two exceptions not avowedly organized against Catholics, are in anything but sympathy with us. From the members of these societies the rank and file and officers of our volunteer force are mainly recruited. For some reason or other Catholics show no great love for soldier's clothes, unless when fighting is to be done for the country. Suppose then "a trap" should be set for one of our processions, and it falls into it, what will follow? Those in the secret of the plot, stationed at convenient points along the line, will know how to raise the proper battle cry, and draw a following to commence the fray; the afternoon papers will give under inflammatory headings their version of the affair; flaming posters will repeat it at every street corner; mob-orators will try their powers of persuasion on the multitude; the "drum ecclesiastic" too, may beat to arms, the military will be called out, and hundreds and even thousands be slaughtered before the state authorities are able to come to the rescue, if even they could be relied on now to do their whole duty in such a contingency. Time was when our volunteers were ready at a moment's warning to stand up bravely, and without bias, in the defense of public order, no matter by whom disturbed. They did so in this city in 1844. But we fear that time is not now. When a President of the United States is not ashamed to hound on against us the veterans of the Army of the Cumberland, what may we not apprehend from the bad influences that can be brought to bear on men who would themselves bring into their ranks the very passions it would be their duty to quell in others?

It would little become us at any time, least of all now, at our first appearance amongst them, to undertake to lecture our brethren of the Catholic press on the grave responsibility that will rest upon them, during the crisis on which the Church has already entered in this country. And, even could we, by any chance, feel ourselves called on to do so, we are unconscious of any grace or gift that would fit us to discharge such a duty. Nevertheless, the importance of the occasion will, we trust, be a sufficient apology for, at least, calling their attention to the subject. Every sentence, every word we write, is weighed and scrutinized by thousands, solely with a view to pervert its meaning, and use against us any imprudent or less guarded expression that may happen to escape from our pens. It is an old device of the enemy. "Then, the Pharisees going, consulted among themselves, how to insnare him in his speech." We cannot, then, be too cautious in what we say, or how we say it. Doing our very best, we will be misunderstood and misrepresented. Let us, at least, be able to feel the consolation of having tried to prevent the one and the other. A veteran Catholic journalist once told us, that having the fear of the gentle critics just alluded to before his eyes, he had long made it a rule to never knowingly write a sentence which, taken from its context, could be made by them to bear a sense that could be rightly considered offensive to non-Catholics. In this it was his good fortune to have succeeded far beyond his expectations. Those of our readers whose memories go back some twenty-five or thirty years ago, may remember how, about that time, the silly and insulting "bounce" of a certain editor for whose words the Catholic body was held responsible, kindled a fire of indignation against us all over the country. Happily, that editor lived to become a wiser and a better man, and to atone, in great measure, for his past imprudence; but the evil he had done lived after him, and bore its bitter fruit for years. No one, we think, can hesitate to say which of these two men the young Catholic writer of the present time had better take for his model, in the one particular to which we have presumed to invite attention. A fool can set the house on fire, though a wise man cannot always extinguish the flames.

We should endeavor to enlighten the prejudice of non-Catholics.

Catholicity, as they understand it, exists only in their own imaginations. So understood, it is a compound of sin and absurdity, which we detest far more than they. We should try, then, to teach them what Catholicity really is. If we can induce a Protestant neighbor to read some compendium of Catholic doctrine, such as the Catechism of the Council of Trent, or even some one of the catechisms in use in our Sunday-schools, we will have done much towards his conversion. When a Protestant has been brought to understand in what, precisely, Catholicity and Protestantism differ, he may still have objections to the Church; but nine-tenths of his previous objections will have disappeared, simply because they were objections to things that form no part of Catholic doctrine. We owe it to Protestants to make an effort to bring them to a knowledge of the truth. They are our fellow-citizens, our brethren in Christ. There are many kind and generous and noble hearts amongst them, who find it painful to be obliged to differ with us. There are those, too, who, though they now oppose us with the blind and restless energy of a Saul, would, did they only know what and whom it is they persecute, rival even his zeal in their efforts to diffuse Catholic truth. Of this we have abundant proof in the long line of learned and devout priests and laymen now in the foremost ranks of the Church's defenders, who, but a few years ago, were among the ablest champions of heresy and unbelief. And if there be others, whose opposition to us springs from motives less pure or less enlightened than theirs, these, more than any others, call for the exercise of our zeal. We have been brought up to a knowledge of the faith, without any sacrifice or merit on our part. Had we been born out of the Church, we might be numbered to-day amongst her blindest and bitterest opponents. We should, then, be patient and charitable with those who oppose her, because they know not what they do. And whilst we enjoy the peace, the security, the certainty, and all the manifold consolations our faith brings us, we should do all that it is possible for us to do, by word, but especially by example, to bring back those who now wander in the ways of doubt and error to the one fold of the one Shepherd.

JAMES O'CONNOR.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE SUPERNATURAL.

Principii di Filosofia Soprannaturale. Libri Tre. Genova. Tipografia del R. I. de' Sordo Muti, vol. i. 1869, vol. ii. 1871, vol. iii. 1872, vol. iv. 1874; 16 mo.

We have no intention of reviewing at present the very remarkable work, the title of which is placed at the head of this article. We have as yet received only four of the five volumes of which it is to consist, and these we have not sufficiently studied to be able to pass an intelligent judgment on their contents. We introduce them in order to express our cordial approval of the author's design, our sense of the rare philosophical and theological learning and ability with which it appears to be executed, and also as a text of some remarks of our own on the general subject, or the so-called philosophy of the supernatural.

There may be readers who doubt if there is or can be any such thing as a philosophy of the supernatural, for there are many persons, who, though they deny not a supernatural order, never recognize any relation or analogy between it and the natural order. For them the Creator's works, instead of forming one dialectic whole, exist as two separate and unrelated, if not antagonistic orders. The author of the work before us is not one of these. He hold that the Creator's works form a complete and harmonious whole, and that the natural finds its complement or fulfillment in the supernatural. The natural and the supernatural form in his view only two parts of one homogeneous and indissoluble whole, and therefore must have a real relation the one to the other, and necessarily have not only their points of analogy, but also somewhere their points of contact. Both orders are homogeneous parts of one system, or of one design, one divine decree, or the one divine creative act. If this is so, there may be a philosophy of the supernatural as well as of the natural.

Philosophy is the science of principles; not, as the superficial thinkers or unthinkers of our materialistic age would have us believe, of sensible or material facts, the proper object of the physical sciences, as astronomy, electricity, chemistry, mechanics, geology, hydraulics, etc. Principles precede facts, originate and govern them. Indeed we know not facts themselves, nor understand their significance or meaning, until we have referred them to their principles. What in the English-speaking world is in our days called philosophy is simply an induction from the observation of the facts of the physical order, and is confined by Sir William Hamilton to physics, psychology and logic, and excludes not only the supernatural, but the supersensible or intelligible, though within the province of natural reason. But without meaning to disparage philosophy in this sense, or the physical sciences, the fruits of which are seen in the mechanical inventions and material progress of the age, we must maintain that it is infinitely below philosophy, properly so-called. It is, in a subordinate sense, *scientia*, but not *sapientia*, according to Aristotle, the science of principles which are upersensible and not obtained by way of induction from sensible facts, whether facts of external nature, or from the soul itself. All principles are supersensible and are objects of the intellect; in no case of the senses. Some of them are known or knowable by the light of nature; others only by the light of supernatural revelation. The science of the former is the philosophy of the natural; of the latter is the philosophy of the supernatural.

These two philosophies are of principles equally certain; for the light of reason and the light of revelation are both emanations of the divine light or Logos, and each is infallible. We may err and take that to be reason which is not reason, or that to be revelation which is not revelation; but neither can itself err, for both rest on the veracity of God, who is Truth itself, and can neither deceive nor be deceived. The science of revealed principles is as truly science as is the science of principles known by the light of nature, and differs from it only as to its medium. We may then speak of the philosophy of the supernatural with as much propriety and confidence as of the philosophy of the natural.

The philosophy of the supernatural follows the analogy of the natural. The philosophy of the natural presents the principles of the natural so far as they are cognizable by natural reason in their intelligible phase, their relation tc one another, and the facts of the sensible order which they explain and govern. The philosophy of the supernatural presents the principles so far as revealed of the supernatural order, their mutual relation and reciprocal dependencies, and their relation to the natural order which they explain and complete, and which without them is not only incomplete, but absolutely without purpose or meaning. This is what the Rev. professor has attempted to show in his *Principii de Filosofia Soprannaturale*, with what success we are not a competent judge; but so far as we have read the volumes published, and are capable of judging, he has not failed; and if he has not completely succeeded, he has proved himself a philosopher and theologian of the first order, and produced a work which for depth, originality, and importance, has not been surpassed, if equalled in modern times. While the professor accepts the maxim, *gratia supponit naturam*, he refutes the rationalistic assumption that the natural exists for itself alone, that it does or can suffice for itself, or is anything without the supernatural in which it has its origin, medium and end.

The questions treated belong properly to the domain of theology, but lie back of those ordinarily treated by our modern theologians. Since the rise of scholasticism, theology has pursued the analytical method, and has been, for the most part, studied in separate questions and articles in detail, rather than as a uniform and indissoluble whole. The articles and dogmas of faith have been dissected, analyzed, accurately described, and labelled, but except by a few superior minds not presented in their unity or as integral and inseparable members of one living body. The objection of the traditionalists to the scholastic method that it is rationalistic and of Döllinger and German professordom that it is theological, not historical, and places reason above revelation, deserves no respect, and, if I am not mistaken, has been reprobated by the Holy See. As against the traditionalists and the German professors, the scholastic method is approved in the Syllabus, but this does not prohibit us from pointing out that it tends to make the student lose sight of the faith objectively considered as an organic whole. What moderately instructed theologian ever regards the natural and the supernatural as parts of one dialectic system, distinct, if you will, but inseparable in the divine decree, or that does not look upon them as two disconnected and independent systems? Who ever thinks of looking below the dogma to the catholic principle that underlies it, governs it, and binds it to every other dogma, and integrates it in the living unity of the divine purpose in creation?

We do not pretend to enumerate and describe the principles of the supernatural philosophy, for we are neither philosopher nor theologian enough for that; we lack both the ability and the learning to do anything of the sort. All we aim at here is to show that there is a philosophy of the supernatural as well as of the natural; and that we live in times when for the vindication of the faith against the various classes of its enemies, it is necessary to recognize and study it to a far greater extent than it is ordinarily studied in our seminaries. The age has no respect for authority, and though we prove conclusively that the Church is divinely commissioned and assisted to teach the faith, and is therefore infallible, we do not meet the real difficulties of the more cultivated classes of unbelievers, or prepare them to accept any article, dogma, or proposition of faith for the reason that she teaches it. The world outside of the Church may be credulous and superstitious, able, as Clemens of Alexandria said to the Greeks, "to believe anything and every thing except the TRUTH," but have undeniably lost all faith in the supernatural order, and really believe only in the natural, if indeed even so much as that. Our spiritists, who profess to have communications with the spirits of the departed, do not really admit a supernatural order. The real cause of this unbelief, so far as it is intellectual, not moral, is in the assumption that the natural and the supernatural are held by the Church as by the sects to be two separate, independent, and unrelated orders, indeed as two antagonistic orders. They take their views of Christian theology not from the teaching of the Church, but from such errorists as Calvinists and Jansenists, who in their theories demolish nature to make way for grace. The supernatural appears to them an anomaly in the Creator's works; something arbitrary, illogical, without any reason in the nature of things, or the principles of the universe. No amount of evidence, they contend, can suffice to prove the reality of any order that is above nature or the reach of natural reason. Hence they attempt to reduce miracles and all marvelous events, too well authenticated to be denied as facts, to the natural order, explicable by natural laws, though we may as yet be ignorant of these laws. Carlyle, one of the oldest of contemporary British thinkers and writers, in his "Sartor Resartus" has a chapter headed *natural-supernaturalism*, in which he reduces the supernatural to the natural, and therefore really denies it while apparently asserting it. Natural supernaturalism is a contradiction in terms; and it is more manly to deny the supernatural outright than it is to attempt to explain it by the operation of natural laws.

Now, it is necessary, in order to meet and refute this objection, and the reasoning by which they who urge it attempt to sustain it, to show that without confounding the supernatural with the natural or obliterating the distinction between them, the supernatural is not anomalous, arbitrary, or illogical, but is as original and integral in the Creator's design as the natural itself. The natural and supernatural are two parts of one original plan of creation, and are distinguished only as the initial is distinguished from the teleological or completion. The natural is initial, the supernatural is teleological, or the perfection or fulfillment of the natural. It was in the beginning, εν αρχη, *in principio*, the design of the Creator that the natural should be perfected, completed, or fulfilled in the supernatural. Indeed, we do not understand how the natural could possibly be perfected in the natural, the creature, which is necessarily imperfect, in the creation. To assume that man can be perfected in the natural order is to assume that he has no destiny, his existence no purpose, and therefore no meaning, which would be tantamount to assuming that he is a mere nullity, nothing at all. Man, nature, the universe, all creation, originates in and proceeds by the creative act of God from the supernatural, for God the Creator is necessarily supernatural, that is, above and over nature. Nature originates in the supernatural, and since we know from revelation, and might almost at least infer from reason itself, that God creates all things for Himself, it has and can have its destiny or end only in the supernatural. The good of every creature is in attaining its end, the fulfillment or perfection of its nature, and hence the notion broached and defended by some theologians —not, indeed, of the first order—of a natural beatitude, is inadmissible, and originates in a superficial and incomplete view of the Creator's design in creation, and, we may add, of the nature of things, in the very assumption on which is founded the objection of the unbeliever. We are considering that nature is a whole, and once created with its laws, suffices or might have sufficed for itself—a purely deistical conception, and not changed in its nature by what these same theologians add, that God by his superabounding goodness has provided for those that love Him something better, even supernatural beatitude. There is and can be no natural beatitude; because, whatever is natural is finite, and the soul hungers and thirsts for an unbounded good, and can be satisfied with nothing short of the Infinite; that is to say, God Himself, who is the Supreme Good in itself. "I shall be satisfied," says holy Job, " when I awake in Thy likeness." There is rest for the soul only in God. Prophets, poets and sages of all nations and ages, as well as Christian preachers have borne witness to the insufficiency of every created or finite good to satisfy the soul and give it real beatitude. All this proves that man was created for a supernatural, not a natural beatitude or end, and therefore that the supernatural entered into the divine plan of creation. When it follows that the alleged *status naturæ puræ* is a pure abstraction, and has never existed in an actual state, as the theologians who insist on it, for the most part, concede and hold, as we do. We are laboring to prove that man, in point of fact, is and always has been under a gracious or supernatural providence, and, therefore, from the first destined to a supernatural end, attainable only through a supernatural medium. The original justice in which Adam was constituted, and which placed him on the plane of his destiny, was supernatural, not produced by his nature; and when by his prevarication he lost it, he fell below his nature, became darkened in his understanding, weakened in his will, and captive to Satan, from whose power he is delivered only by the Incarnate Word.

That man is created for a good that transcends nature is indicated not only by his inability to satisfy himself with any natural, that is, created good, but also by his consciousness of his own imperfection or incompleteness, that his reason is limited, and that he is capable of being more than he is or can be by his unassisted natural powers. There is something mysterious and inexplicable to us in this fact—a fact which seems to us to imply that we have an obscure sense of the supernatural, which the vast majority of mankind in all ages and nations in one form or another recognize. Gioberti, in his *Teorica Sovrannaturale*, ascribed it to a faculty of the soul, which he calls *Sovrintelligenza*, that is to say, a natural faculty of knowing what transcends nature. But this seems to us inadmissible, indeed a contradiction in terms. A faculty is a power, and the faculty asserted by Gioberti would be the power of knowing the superintelligible. But if we have a natural faculty of knowing the superintelligible, it is not superintelligible, but intellibible. Yet the fact that reason asserts her own limitations, and therefore something beyond which limits her, or that nature asserts her own insufficiency, whatever the explanation, is indisputable. This to us proves the reality of the supernatural and its relation to the natural, though it tells us not what the supernatural is, or what are its specific principles.

We may perhaps establish even more conclusively still the reality of the supernatural, and the relation of the natural to it, by rational science or reason itself. The Holy See has defined against the Traditionalists and Anti-Scholastics that the existence of God as well as the immortality of the soul and the free will of man can be proved with certainty by reason prior to faith, and I think I have fully proved that God is, in my Essay in Refutation of Atheism, published in the Last Series of *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, whatever may be thought of my criticisms on one or two popular arguments commonly adduced to prove the divine existence. The principles of rational science, as the author of the work before us asserts, are all included in the ideal or rational formula, *l' Ente crea l' esistenze*, or *Ens creat existentias.* We say nothing here as to the way in which the mind comes into possession of this formula, but this much we hold is certain, that there is no mental operation and no mind possible, without the principles summarized or expressed by it. These principles connect all existences with God by His creative act, and consequently show that the natural is really related to the supernatural, for the Creator of nature is necessarily above nature, that is, supernatural.

As existences *a contingenti* proceed from the supernatural, *mediante* the creative act of God, it follows that the assumption of unbelievers and modern infidel scientists is inadmissible, namely, that the natural and supernatural are two distinct, separate, and unrelated orders, and that the supernatural is not nesessary to complete the science of the natural. The contrary is the scientific fact; and, as the natural does not and cannot exist without the supernatural, the science of the supernatural by divine revelation or otherwise is essential even to the science of the natural. There is no science without principles, and all principles are supernatural, even the principles of the natural order itself. They who undertake to explain the cosmos by what they call natural laws, which are obtained by induction from the facts they observe, uniformly fail, and fall into the greatest absurdities, as we see in old Democritus and Epicurus, as well as in such miserable charlatans as Darwin, Tyndall, Huxley, and Herbert Spencer; because induction from facts gives only generalizations, classifications called natural laws, never transcending the region of facts or the particulars generalized or classified. It never gives us principles, which always precede the facts, produce, underlie and control them.

We have established two points, namely, that the supernatural really exists, and that the natural has its principle, origin, and end in it, and therefore is dialectically or really related to it, dependent on it as the creation is dependent on the Creator, or the effect on the cause. We speak with diffidence, for we are fully aware of our own limited knowledge; but we think that our theologians have not dwelt with due emphasis on this second point, the dialect relations of the natural to the supernatural, and have, by their neglect, given occasion to unbelievers to suppose that we really, when we are not assumed to deny nature in the sense of Calvinists and Jansenists, exclude the supernatural from the primary design of creation, and hold it and the natural to be two separate and unrelated orders. We know that it was a long time before we learned to connect them by a real nexus, to think of them otherwise than as two parallel orders, without any real passage from the one to the other, any reason in the constitution of the natural for anticipating or asserting the supernatural. They seem to us, in their fear of running one order into the other, and confounding nature with grace, to have left it to be inferred that the natural order would have sufficed for us, if God in His excessive goodness had not resolved to provide something better for us.

Having established by rational science the reality of the supernatural, and of the dialectic relation of the natural to it, or that the natural and the supernatural are parts of one and the same system, we may proceed to inquire what are the principles of the supernatural, or, as says our author, "of the Philosophy of the supernatural." This is a subject that is only imperfectly treated by our modern theologians, for our theologians have, from the scholastics down, generally pursued, as we have said, the analytic method, and have been more intent on stating, elucidating, and defending the several articles and dogmas of the faith separately than on considering them as whole, or in their synthetic relations. They have dissected the faith for the convenience of teaching it; studied and described with due precision and exactness its several parts; but they rarely enable the student to view the faith as a whole, or its several parts in their systematic relations, or in connection with the principle from which they all proceed. The theologians follow the method of the catechism, indeed, but rarely do more than simply develop and amplify it. We say not, and must not be understood as implying that they do not teach the truth, or all that is necessary for salvation. Indeed for the generality of mankind the analytic method is the only practical method. It is the only method possible in catechisms, and in them we must adopt it, or abandon all catechetical instruction. This method is natural, is sufficient for all except those whose duty it is to set forth and defend the faith against its more subtle assailants. It does not suffice to refute the objections of unbelievers in our day, who have gone so far as to reject all authority, not only of revelation, but of reason itself. To meet these we must have the philosophy of the faith.

The *principium* or principle, as we have seen, of philosophy, or rational science, or the science of reason, is *Ens creat existentias*, or as the author of the work before us says, *l'Ente crea l'existente*, Being creates or is creating existences, corresponding to the first verse of *Genesis*. "*In principio*, *Deus creavit cœlum et terram*," or to the first article in the creed, " I believe in one God, maker of heaven and earth, and all things visible and invisible." Those scientists, whether in ancient or modern times, who seek to explain the origin of things without the recognition either of one God or His creative act are worthy of no consideration, and may be set down as ignorant of the first principle of all science, and as perceiving no distinction between a principle and a fact, or a fact and a factor. The world is not eternal; for what is eternal is one, and immutable, and can not of itself change either in substance or in form. Yet the world is multiple and constantly changing. All things change their form at least under the very eye of the spectator. There is no change without motion, and there is no motion without a first mover itself immovable; for an infinite series is an infinite absurdity. It matters not that it is said only the form changes, for the form cannot change itself any more than the substance can change itself. The change must have a beginning, which must be the effect of a cause independent of itself. Hence Herbert Spencer's pretense that the universe is explicable by evolution, by matter and motion, by the simple processes of expansion and contraction, or concentration and dispersion, is repugnant to every principle of science or reason. Whence the concentration or the dispersion? They result from the inherent laws of matter, it is said. But the inherent laws of matter must be always the same, and operate always in the same direction, and therefore cannot of themselves produce such contrary results as concentration and dispersion. Wherever there is change there must be a cause independent of the thing changed, and this necessarily induces the assertion of a First Cause, itself uncaused, and effectively disposes of the doctrine, which asserts that the principle of things, though intelligent, is inherent in the cosmos, or that makes God the soul of the world—as did Plato and Aristotle, or as does Brahminism.

The universe is explicable, and science in any degree possible only by virtue of the rational formula, *Ens creat existentias*, Being is creating or creates, existences or creatures. This is the first and last principle of all rational or ideal philosophy.

The principle of theology, or what we here call supernatural philosophy, and known to us only by revelation, is, our author says, "The Father through Christ, (*per Christo*) deificates or is deifying existences or creatures," that is, supernaturally elevating them to union or oneness with God, the creature to oneness with the Creator. The medium of this deification is the Incarnation, or the Word made flesh. The fact affirmed in the ideal or rational formula that existences proceed from God by way of creation, or that God creates the world, and is its first cause, proves that He creates it for some end, that it has a final cause, and a final cause and end, like its first cause above and beyond itself. We know from rational philosophy that our final cause or the end for which we are created is supernatural, but we know only in a general way that it is supernatural, not specifically or in particular in what it consists. This we know only by revelation. We can know from reason that God creates us for Himself, because beside Him there is nothing for which He can create us. But we cannot know from reason, that He creates us to deify us, to make us one with Himself, "partakers," as St. Peter says, "of His divine nature, *naturæ consortes divinæ*.' Nor can we know by natural reason that this deification of the creature is to be effected through the Incarnation or the Word made flesh. "*Verbum caro factum est*." The whole principle and scope of the teleological order, or what Gioberti calls the second cycle or the return of existences to God without absorption in Him as their final cause or last end, transcends the reach of our natural faculties, or the light of nature, and is known only by supernatural revelation.

As the philosophy of the natural order consists in the reduction of the facts of that order to their principles and their integration in the ideal or rational formula, *Ens creat existentias*, so supernatural philosophy, or theology, consists in the reduction of all the facts, mysteries, articles, and dogmas of the supernatural order and their integration in the revealed formula, "The

Father through Christ deificates or is deificating *existentias*, or the creature, that is, elevating the creature to oneness with the Creator. The medium of the revealed formula is the Word made flesh or the Incarnation, that is, the Hypostatic Union, by which the created nature becomes the nature of God, or the creature is made one with the Creator, as the medium of the rational or ideal formula is the creative act of Being, *Ens*, or God. It is in this medium or creative act that the natural and supernatural coalesce and become one, for the Hypostatic Union, or the Incarnation of the Word is effected by the creative act, and is that act raised to its highest power, is its supreme effort; for it is impossible for the creative act to rise higher or to go further than to make the creature one with its Creator. The two orders, the natural and supernatural, are dialectically united by one and the same medium, and —inasmuch as both proceed from the same principle—by one and the same divine creative act.

The point we make here is that the act which creates the natural is the identical act which creates the Hypostatic Union, and founds the supernatural. The Hypostatic Union, or Incarnation, is itself in the initial order, in the first cycle, order of the procession of existences by act of creation from God as first cause. It completes that order of carrying the creative act to its highest pitch, and initiates or founds the teleological order, or the order of the return of existences without absorption in Him to God, as final cause, or their last end. This order, called by St. Paul and usually termed the supernatural order, is therefore founded on the Incarnation. In it we enter by regeneration, and the race are propagated by the election of grace from Christ by the Holy Ghost, as in the first cycle, or the initial order, they are propagated from Adam by natural generation. Hence Christ is called the second Adam, the Lord from heaven. He is the Father of regenerated humanity, as Adam is of generated or natural humanity. Hence we see the reason why without the new birth it is impossible to enter the kingdom of heaven or to see God.

If the natural and the supernatural universe are homogeneous parts of one and the same system, the point on which we here specially insist, the whole of both parts have their unity in the principle from which they proceed, and as the natural is created and exists for the supernatural, it is integrated in the principle of the supernatural, *Verbum caro factum est*, or the Incarnation. Hence it follows that the entire creation, whether in the natural or supernatural, the initial or the teleological order, exists for the Incarnation, and finds in its relation to the Word made flesh its significance, its purpose, its unity, and its integrity. This granted, it follows again that the denial of the Incarnation would be the denial not only of the entire supernatural order or the whole Christian system, but of all existences, whether natural or supernatural, by denying this final cause, as essential to any created existence as the first cause. It would deny the very end for which all things exist, and deny the universe itself, by denying it any purpose or meaning. What means nothing is nothing. The Incarnation is the key to all the Creator's works, and we have not mastered theology or the philosophy of the supernatural, till we are able to say that the denial of any one item in those works involves the denial of the Incarnation, or the Word made flesh. It is the highest and supreme principle of all science, and without it nothing in the universe is scientifically explicable. The greatest absurdity into which men can fall, is that of our modern scientists, who imagine that there can be science without theology, and who affect to treat theology as no science at all, but a vain imagination, or the product of a superstitious fancy. The Scholastics understood the matter, when they treated theology as "the Queen of the Sciences." The feebleness, superficiality and conceitedness of the modern sciences are unquestionably due to the very general neglect in our day of the study of theology. By that neglect men have lost the key to the sciences, become weak in understanding, puffed up with a foolish pride, and nearly as stupid as the brute beasts from which they imagine they have been evolved. In reading their work, one is tempted to doubt the fact of the evolution. A respectable monkey might well disown the speculations of a Darwin, a Tyndall, a Huxley, a Sir John Lubbock, a Herbert Spencer, to say nothing of their congeners in France and Germany. Yet these are the instructors, and held to be the great lights of the age, entitled to look down with pity on a St. Augustine, a St. Gregory the Great, a St. Thomas, and all renowned theologians who, under God, have rescued the human race from the barbarism, ignorance and superstition into which the great Gentile Apostasy had plunged them, and into which apostasy from the papacy is plunging them anew.

It follows from the unity of the principle of both the natural and the supernatural that the creation in both its parts is one system, and also that the faith is one, and the several articles and dogmas recognized and treated by theologians form not simply a union, but are strictly one, flowing from one and the same principle, through one and the same medium, to one and the same end. Hence the destructive nature of heresy, which accepts some articles of the faith and rejects others. As all depend alike on the Incarnation, the principle of the teleological order, the denial of any one item of the faith is the denial of the Incarnation. All heresy impugns the Incarnation, and is of the nature of infidelity, or the absolute rejection of Christ, the Word made flesh. This theology or the philosophy of the Supernatural must establish, as we intended to prove in this present article by descending to particulars, and showing it in detail; but, much to our regret, we must reserve it for a future opportunity. We shall on resuming the subject endeavor to show the relation of each particular doctrine of the Church to the Incarnation, and make good the several positions thus far assumed. O. A. Brownson.

THE CLASSICAL EDUCATION OF THE DAY.

Semper ego auditor tantum, nunquamne reponam?
Juvenal.

The Americans very naturally object to the admission that anything in our country and its institutions is not of the very first class and quality; nor is the feeling which prompts such dislike an unsuitable one. It is right and proper that people should admire their own country; but it is manifestly absurd that our predilection should be so indiscriminate as to close our eyes either to our own faults, or to the excellence of other countries and other people. Now, without speaking more specifically for the present, of some other points in regard to which the comparison, if fairly drawn, would not result in our favor, we propose in this paper to speak of classical education in the United States, and to compare it with the same thing in some of the countries of the old world. We are sorry to be obliged to make in advance the admission that with few and rare exceptions, which the writer rather takes for granted through patriotism than knows to exist from experience, we are lamentably and painfully behind some of the countries which the popular speakers of the day are in the habit of denominating the "effete European countries." It will be the object of the present paper to show firstly the fact; secondly what are the causes that have conduced thereto; and finally in what manner *subsidio seu remedio veniendum est.* And as there is a much higher use for patriotic impulse than in becoming foolishly angry with those who show us our faults, it is to be hoped that the strictures necessarily made, and which from their truth will cut in many quarters deeply, will be received in the firm, but kindly spirit in which the writer (himself an American) fain hopes that he is laying these before the community.

It must be very evident to those whose fortune it was to be conversant as teachers or taught, or as mere "lookers on in Venice," with the colleges of our country some twenty or twenty-five years ago, that while the grade of knowledge in Latin and Greek then and there acquired compared by no means favorably, either as to extent or depth, with that of European institutions of much less pretension, yet even that minimum of acquirements has been year by year decreasing both in amount and in thoroughness. For this we appeal to the actual consciousness and inner conviction of those who either as examiners, trustees, or merely educated citizens of public spirit, have kept themselves conversant with the run of the various colleges of their own or of other denominations in their respective vicinities. In short, we all know that the graduate of nowadays, from some of the "best" institutions, knows so little of Latin and Greek, that even his own gross ignorance thereof, though backed by the presumption engendered by the possession of a diploma, would shame to attempt, we will not say making himself orally intelligible in tolerably correct Latinity, but even to write a Latin letter with any assurance of correctness.*

It would be useless, as it is uncalled for, here to enter into a dissertation on the importance of these studies, of their absolute necessity in any system of education destined to reach beyond the merest elements, of the utter inadequacy of any substitutes ever yet devised in their stead, and of the further fact that without a fair and full knowledge of classics, we grope in the dark as professional men, at least, for knowledge of our own vernacular. We write for those who know classics, and who need no arguments on this subject. To the limited range of intellect in the Indian or South Sea Islander, the use of clothing is cumbrous, and of houses absurd; but clothing is none the less desirable, nor are houses to be lightly dispensed with, though he should perceive no advantage in cotton or woolen mills, nor appreciate the architecture even of Michael Angelo.

Now, how many of our graduates are there from the various colleges, who when taken out of the few and perfunctorily learned books of Nepos, Cæsar, Cicero, Virgil and Horace, read and understand with even tolerable facility a half page of hitherto unseen Latin? How many who will succeed at anything like a rigid scrutiny of *concord, accord* and *government*, even in the books of the ordinary curriculum? How many who will read a few lines of Ovid or Virgil so that the ear will distinguish them from prose? How many who could be said by any stretch of charitable language to have become imbued with the spirit of the classics, failing which the whole value of the study, even as a mental. discipline, either very seriously diminishes or goes by the board? Those who know, answer at once that they are "rari nantes," and we address ourselves only to those who know whereof they speak. In all the arts and sciences, we Americans stand fully abreast of all other countries, or at least we think so: in mechanics far enough ahead of them all. Now, why should we be so far behindhand in this, one of the most important; and on our own catalogical showing the most prominent of the branches of study pursued in our colleges?

---

* We carefully refrain from saying, in this paper, anything of the knowledge of Hebrew imparted in some Theological Seminaries, barely premising that those who know Hebrew, and know these institutions, estimate them at a considerably lower value than do the weak old ladies, and weaker men, who club together to advance young men, generally their own personal kith and kin, to acquire therein the mental pabulum deemed necessary to launch them upon a congregation. This is more particularly true of the various sects, which advance means very promptly for the object of aiding "indigent young men with a call to the ministry." Unfortunately enough, the subject is one that, for obvious reasons, almost precludes the possibility of going into details; yet the facts will hardly be impugned, unless by these whose zeal outruns their discretion, and whose knowledge of classics is not even of sufficient extent to enable them to have an inkling of how much they do not know.

1. The multiplication of colleges in the interest, real or supposed, of the numerous and jarring sects has sown the country broadcast with a weedy crop of little unfledged institutions, without means sufficient to enable them to attain even the grade of respectable grammar and high schools; and unfortunately not representing sufficient ability "to preserve them from putrefaction." The members of the sects, at bottom hostile, whatever may be the surface pretence, are under an impression, somehow sedulously fostered by their ministers, that their sons cannot be properly taught the alphabet, or the multiplication table, much less the five declensions, or the verbs in μι save by somebody of their own special "Scheme of Salvation" as they ludicrously enough are apt to term it. As to patronizing a Catholic College, where efforts are made to give a good education, they would refuse it with horror. There exists now in a few localities of the United States a small and obscure sect called "Seceders," a relic of the theological bickerings of two centuries ago, or less, in Scotland, but an anachronism in the present day, and in this country. Yet a man of this persuasion, in all other discernible respects a sensible person, took away his sons from a good, or at any rate, a fair school, as things go, near his own home, almost at his door, and sent them to an adjoining state, to a newly established boarding-school, merely because the founder of the new school preached seceding doctrines, and opened and closed the school with seceding prayers. He was, moreover, a man to whom, on account of his limited means, the difference between keeping his boys at home on the farm and boarding them abroad was by no means an inconsiderable item. There are many thousands of just such men, conscien-

tious and honest, but narrow-minded. Here we do not think of including Catholics, who are bound by the teaching of the Church, which never was nor could be a sect, and which speaks authoritatively on this point, and "not like the Scribes." We speak of the sects around us, and assert that they are very liable to patronize inefficient teachers, especially in their academies and various boarding-schools, and are absolutely sure to have narrow-minded ones, who just as frequently fail in their aim of inculcating certain dogmas and practices, since we know by experience of long standing amongst them, no better way to disgust a boy with such unsubstantial assertions, than to have them thrust upon him in season and out of season, as they are usually in such small institutes. It is with pain that we add the tendency, so strong as to be almost universal with the brighter boys, viz: to bring all religion and devotion into something nearly approaching contempt, by an enforced attendance on exercises which ought to be laid down in such way that the conscience of the youth would speak out to him personally, and manifest to him his duty, which would be the case, if the matter was reasonably placed before him, and he would soon esteem it a privilege and blessing. Among many of the sects, a superannuated minister, or if not that, one who has, to put it mildly, not been a success as a pastor, has the sway, and the people, the dear people, cunning and shrewd enough in other matters of business, are always ready (we speak of the large majority) firstly, to believe that every minister knows Latin and Greek; and secondly, that by the mere fact of being a parson, he knows how to teach. Now there are many hundreds of different sects in the United States, and the result in the ante-collegiate course of boys, is a corresponsive one. Furthermore, it will be found on inquiry that subordinate to such principal, the ushers or assistants are nearly always unfledged and, in many cases, raw youths with views towards the ministry, or a call of that ilk *of course*, which aforesaid call is supposed in some inexplicable way to make up for all deficiencies of culture and manners.

Next in order, and quite too numerous, are the schools of the Squeers sort. Well, not exactly in all respects deserving that epithet; for cruelty of the sort practiced by the Yorkshire pedagogue could not exist in our country for a week. We mean schools gotten up by individuals, or run by them purely and solely with a view to making money:—the principal being the purveyor and business man of the concern, and the teachers as few as it is possible to get on with, making any show before the community, and procured at a compensation but little removed from that of a day laborer. You see their advertisements daily with "damnable iteration," and there are certain ear-marks even in their advertisements by which they are at once stamped so as to be unmistakable. Parents are advised to *send early*, lest the school be filled in advance of their application. As anybody can get a reference which costs nothing—for it is a harsh thing to refuse a fairly dressed man in your own community, particularly about election-times—a list of references is usually subjoined; subsequent small announcements appear, stating that there are vacancies for two, four, six or eight more pupils: catalogues are distributed very lavishly, in which the religious and moral influences of the localities are lauded to the starry heavens: a large and extensive library is spoken of, usually either not existing at all, or else made up of dilapidated Sunday-school books and tracts, eked out by census, patent office, and post-office reports, with some stray volumes of congressional reports, and a few geological surveys. Such men are very apt to boast of a philosophical apparatus, consisting, in fact, of a wheezy air pump and an ineffectual galvanic battery. There is always an imposing array of teachers' (we beg their pardon, of professors') names: said professors being largely made up of professional gentlemen of the vicinity, who never make, and never are expected to make, an appearance at the school, but who think it tells well at a distance to have their names in the catalogue; and there is always to be found in such catalogues, the favorite preacher, who being "such a sweet man," does up the æsthetical part of the business for this and probably an adjoining female accomplishment manufactory, until his collapse, which generally takes place in due time. These institutions are simply and plainly pretentious frauds; and they do this ineradicable harm, if no other, to the boys who frequent them, that the pupil, seeing his pretentiously pious, always moral in appearance, at least, and sometimes Reverend instructor, sham and lie in print, comes to the conclusion that his own verbal lapses from strict truth are by comparison mere peccadillos. Boys are shrewd and unerring judges of anything within their sphere, and he has to be such a hypocrite as the world never yet saw, who can go long undetected by them, while occupying the position of their teacher. The phrase is a current one, "lying as a tomb-stone," but it might well be varied so as to read: "mendacious as an Academy's Catalogue."

Yet another class of schools preparatory for college, put the price of board and tuition at a rate not more than sufficient to pay the commonest board, trusting to the numbers that such an inducement will persuade to attend, and to the almost unlimited "Extras," which may be and are stuck on at every step. Any study beyond reading, writing and arithmetic called "ciphering," is an "Extra;" washing, lights, matches, fires, mending, wear and tear of room, chalk, ink, paper, etc., etc., etc., *all extra*. The principal and teachers are of one or the other of the two classes above shadowed, and more frequently of the latter than the former; and the main idea is to keep pupils as long as possible, so that the most may be made out of them.

A boy who stumbles at every third word or so in reading, and who cannot by possibility understand one tenth of what he reads, is thrust into English Grammar, Natural Philosophy, History, Analysis of Words, it may be, and very likely into a class in Latin, studying from a text-book which happens to be in vogue at that special place. If there be a stray Frenchman loose around the house, the pupil is made to study Ollendorff's or some equivalent system. Should such an one not exist, the principal's wife, or some female relative who has graduated (forsooth) at a female Academy, and who teaches the language "after the school of Stratford atte Bowe," answers the purpose just as well, and there is the superadded advantage in this, that she also thrums somewhat on the guitar, or tinkles the clattering piano, when, of course, her competency as a music teacher is unquestionable.

With this statement of the mode in which many schools are commenced, of the motives which practically animate their principals, and the kind of teaching material, it need not surprise us that so many of our boys taken from academies and schools of that grade seem to have learned little or nothing; that they neither read nor spell well; that their general information is so exceedingly defective, and that those who learn Latin and Greek grammar seem, for the most part, to have hardly the remotest conception of the use of the cases, of tense or of voice, nay, even of number and person!

It would be absurd to expect from boys so thoroughly at sea in the elements even a fair idea of idiom. Nor is the classification so universal but that we know some good schools to exist (especially when Religious Orders, or Catholic clergymen, have the duty and see to the teaching, and of these we do not *now* speak,) and, no doubt, such are to be found; but those in whose way it has fallen to examine many of their pupils, must come to the conclusion that good schools are rare, and in number very few. The already mentioned sectarian or local prejudice, blatant pretension, diligent advertising and skillfully worded clap-trap, have so great an effect on the average American, that the day is carried, and the school which imparts no acquisition of any permanent worth will succeed in numbers, the kind of success that is wanted by those in charge; while the genuine one, where it exists, proffering no easy methods, pursuing solid studies, acquiring them carefully and accurately, and making use of no specious pretense "ad captandum," dwindles in numbers, or at best barely maintains its ground; but the only success that the community can fully appreciate, fails it utterly.

It follows from what has been said, that such of these boys as are intended for college come up to the institution, when they are to be matriculated, at all stages of preparation, or rather want of it; and though there is at most of our higher grade colleges an examination for admission, the literary acquirements necessary to succeed are even on the showing of their catalogues barely nominal, and how wretchedly soever the candidate may be prepared, experience proves to us the rarity of failure. At West Point, and at Annapolis, on the other hand (which cannot, however, strictly be called literary institutions, classics being taught in neither), from the obvious fact that neither the institutions themselves, nor the fees of the Faculty, nor their hold upon the public, depend in any regard on their numbers, a very large proportion of the young men described fail in the literary requirements, meagre as they are.

Now admit, for argument's sake, the professor of classics in college to be conscientious, a scholar and a teacher (no two of which characteristics necessarily and always unite in the same person, much less all three), we ask what is he to do, what can he do, when a Freshman class of eighty or a hundred comes before him? Three-fourths of them are utterly unprepared to profit by any such instruction as *should* be given in college, even to the lowest class. One-eighth are inefficiently prepared, and we will say for the sake of argument, that the remaining one-eighth are fairly ready for the proper class instruction. If he directs his instruction to the second class, he shoots, during the greater part of the year, over the heads of the first, and repeats a thrice-told tale to the third section, who become careless and weary, mentally asking themselves why they came here, and whether this be the so much vaunted, and by them dreaded college, of the profundity of instruction at which they had in previous years heard so much; while some of the first section may perhaps in their new fervor strive for a week or two to follow the Professor, the majority not even attempting that; and all in a short time fall into a sort of mental apathy and carelessness, one part because of the impossibility of making up for the lost or inadequate instruction they should have acquired at the academy, and another because they knew it all before, and fancy themselves preternaturally sagacious and learned. Meantime the Professor himself is with one-eighth of the class plunging away at explications which never ought to be needed beyond a fair grammar-school. This is no fancy sketch, for the writer has occupied just such a position in one of the first institutions, by current repute then and now, in the country. Only, in his case, the classes were larger in numbers, and the proportion of those properly prepared fell far short of one-eighth. What can be expected from such a class when it comes up for graduation? Is it not clear where our classical inferiority originates and has its prime cause? It is not the fault of the boys themselves, for no country in the world contains brighter ones; but it is the fault of the careless, incompetent, haphazard and money-making teachers who have had the charge of their previous education. The boy who is allowed to come up to college without a clear idea of the distinction between an adverb and an adjective in any language, is exceedingly likely to go through college, and to graduate, without acquiring it. We have personally known both things to occur, and the person referred to now prepares young men for college himself; at least he is Principal of an academy.

It may well be said in the matter of education that everything depends on a good beginning; and in college there neither is nor should be any chance of making up for the years lost at an academy. Nor is it, as unfortunately too many people are apt to imagine, a matter of comparative indifference *who* teaches our sons at the academy, or whether their grade of acquirement and mental calibre be high or not; since unless the instruction at that stage in education be thorough, there is very little hope that the loss will ever be made good. Were the subject not so serious, and the results so momentous, those announcements would be simply ludicrous which gravely inform us that " M—— will teach Arithmetic, Algebra, Mensuration and the *elements of Latin and Greek*." The plain fact remains, and scholars know it, that he who knows only the *elements* of Latin and Greek does not know even those elements. Of course there are some self-made men, and our fellow citizens are very fond of the phrase; but they are fewer than is generally supposed; and the vast majority of those who have succeeded in acquiring a ripe education will acknowledge that all their efforts were but a groping in the dark, till they found a teacher who fully understood his subject, knew how to explain and make it interesting, was competent to answer clearly and intelligibly any questions upon it that the boy, always very ready that way, might put on it, and thus opened up to the juvenile mind a new, an interesting and a hitherto undiscovered world. Such a teacher has, however, most palpably been wanting to the majority of young men who enter our colleges in these days, and for some time past. Here then is the great cause of our lack, laughed at by observant foreigners, palpable to any one who examines the subject, and acknowledged with mortification by the most discerning among ourselves. Of course it would be requiring too much of human nature to expect academical principals and teachers, or indeed college professors *en masse*, to join us in the admission of the defect, or in the assignment of the prime cause which we have made. The cry that "by this craft we have our livelihood" is as potent now as in the days of the coppersmith of Ephesus.

Thanks, too, to the ardor of the booksellers and book-makers for money-making, the text-books are multiplied without rhyme or reason; and few men have taught a brace of years without feeling called on to write a book on the specific subject of their instruction. Booksellers are always ready to publish such books for a man at the head of a well-frequented academy, book agents to laud it to the skies, school boards properly manipulated to introduce it by vote to the schools they control. It would be hard if the prominent pastor of the town or village adjacent did not recommend it. We say nothing of the results of this fecundity in books in other branches (parents and others patronizing schools know something at least of the pecuniary tax, and of the "different edition" annoyance:) but we charge it with being an important though a secondary cause of the decay and desuetude of classical learning amongst us; and this is how it happens: Latin and Greek are from their nature and from their literatures fixed and changeless. There is and should be no possibility of original views on the grammar of those languages; and, as a matter of fact, the Port Royal, Eton, Wettenhall, Ruddiman and Busby grammars contain all that it is desirable, nay even possible for the boy to learn at this stage of his course, and that too gotten up in a form far more intelligible, far more easily memorized, less mixed with extraneous and, to the boy, incomprehensible disquisitions, than any, singly or all together, of the new-fangled grammars, schemes, methods, phrase-books and easy plans gotten up in either Latin or Greek since the beginning of the century. In point of fact it would seem as though the decadence of classical knowledge went *pari passu* with the multiplication of text-books on the subject. You must teach the language to boys as it is, before you begin to philosophize and theorize to them about what it probably was in remote ages, or what it might be in future ones. It is worse than folly to attempt to explain the theory of nominal or verbal roots to a boy who does not yet know the five declensions, nor the four regular conjugations, or the scheme of the Indo-European languages to the lad who does not yet comprehend the agreement of a verb with its nominative in his own; and so, by attempting too much, as well as by the improper and piecemeal presentation of what is necessary, you succeed in nothing but in imparting to the pupil a rooted disgust for the study, and a full conviction, enduring through life, that it is one of those things "*that no fellow can find out.*" Yet this is what a great majority of our superabundant text-books try to do; and the remainder do worse by attempting to minimize, giving, for example, the nominative and objective of a single declension at one lesson; fag ends of pronouns and the verb "*esse*" at a second; a couple of persons in a tense or two of "*amo*," at a third; and so on to the bitter end of such book; but at no time presenting the whole of a single subject compactly and squarely together, so that the pupil may have a full survey and a fair intelligence of it. Why even the old grammar of *Ross*, published early in this century in a neighboring city, curt, lacking, and unphilosophical though it was, contained more that was necessary, less that was extraneous, and made more and abler scholars in Latin than would stacks of these miserable, windy, pretentious and insincere make-shifts, were they multiplied to millions in numbers and by myriads in effective influence. Another cause largely contributing to the decay of classical learning among us, is the strong tendency of our American people towards cheap, patent and easy roads to learning of all kinds, but in no branch of science are the results so baleful as in the study or want of study of Latin and Greek. In acquiring these tongues so much must of necessity depend on mere memory in the first stages, so much must be absolutely gotten by rote, that our ancestors very properly put a simple Latin grammar into the boy's hands who was destined or intended even from the age of seven years to become a literary man; rightly judging that the faculty of memory was cultivable in the boy, long before there was any possibility of appealing to the judgment. There followed then an age of weak teaching, the Lancasterian, the Pestalozzian, the Hamiltonian as applied to primary and secondary schools, the Ollendorffian, and other, if possible, more absurd and ludicrous modes, culminating in the various modern languages "in six easy lessons without a master," applied to the acquisition of European languages, but from which neither boy nor man ever yet acquired a cent's worth of knowledge, further than the general fact that the system was a cheat. Some of these have had their day, and been exploded; others still have vogue; and yet others under one name or another are tickling the fancies of those who are eager for anything new, merely on account of its novelty. In classics we see books intended to compress the whole subject of Latin and Greek, or either grammar into a nutshell; others that profess to do away with all necessity for the study thereof; and yet other more specious frauds that, if they have any aim other than that of making money for their compilers and the booksellers, tend to produce the impression that grammatical forms, rules and paradigms, are to be acquired with no trouble. We have been and are politically a ring-ruled people (we beg pardon for the use of a slang term, but Americans understand it best); and the ring dynasty has taken hold of, and is controlling our text-books in school matters generally; more especially, or rather, we should say, with greater injury to the cause of education in the classics than in many other branches (though in this free country, and in the common schools, chiefly patronized by the wealthy, and in which the simply poor are derided or despised,) the books saddled on the children are almost always sectarian and lying. The authors of such books are not scholars themselves—no scholar needs to be told this; but they are shrewd oftentimes, know well the processes of manipulation, the tendency to gullibility on the part of the public, and the all-pervading ignorance of classics. I have now before me a sheet purporting to give, in the space of less than a page, the entire forms of the four regular conjugations in Latin; the author of which asserts in print that, after two hours study thereof, the student will know as much of the Latin verb as Cicero himself; and he sets forth letters of recommendation which, from the positions held by those signing them, should be of weight; but which, in such connection, only serve to show in a strong light "with how little knowledge the world is governed," and how easily letters commendatory are gotten by any one for almost anything. There are also before me three different editions of a very superficial work on Latin grammar, all published within a few years; no two alike in paging or in sequence of subjects, but no one containing anything more than each other; it simply seeming as though the same *matter* had been riddled through a sieve into each, and chance had decided which should come first, which last, and which mid-way. Here the form of the matter is palpably a catch to force a purchase of the two latter editions: no teacher being able either to assign lessons, or to hear a class of boys supplied, as would frequently happen, with all these. In short, it does not matter how silly the theory, how absurd the treatment, how insane the plan, men can be readily found to compile if it promises novelty, booksellers to publish if it promises money, *distinguished* names to recommend it; and the public, which for the most part has no knowledge in the premises, is of course largely swayed by any names in print, more especially by those that are known.

Again, our young men are over anxious to launch themselves out in life. Those of them who wish to enter the professions soon find out that large masses of physicians and lawyers in our country know supremely little beyond set phrases of Latin and Greek; that others know, if less be possible, still less Greek; and that there is no absolute requirement, either by the law of the land or by the statutes of the most of our colleges, for their knowing any. The effect of this knowledge is obvious. Seven years will be required, even with good brains, industry, and thorough teaching and training, to acquire such knowledge of classics as would justly entitle any one to the name of a classical scholar: for in nothing else can it more truly be said that "a little learning is a dangerous thing." Here are clearly seven years gained, and a large amount of severe and drudging study (how severe only those who have tried it can know!) avoided. Can any one doubt the conclusion at which the youth immediately arrives? He would be a paragon indeed were he not to be misled into taking the easier path and shorter cut. A vague idea still subsists in the general mind, that clergymen must know Latin and Greek. It is also thought by some, that the study of Hebrew would benefit them somewhat. They are, however, doing their utmost to prove the falsity of both assumptions; and though there is a nominal requirement of a Latin exegesis for ordination, as they persist in calling it, among the straiter sects, and of some knowledge of the Greek of the New Testament, yet those who have been behind the scenes, who are themselves scholars, and who have had an opportunity to judge individually of any considerable number of such gentlemen of the white neckcloth, are well aware that such requirements are specious shams, and that the great bulk of them know nothing, or its equivalent, *very little*, of classics. There are exceptions, but they are few among our countrymen. Of Hebrew as taught, we do not purpose to speak at this time. Now the student who has not as yet acquired the classic tongues, cannot possibly know the advantages derived from their acquisition; but he is apt to have a clear, if not an exaggerated notion of their difficulties, and it is not to be wondered at that, seeing so many others pass along without them in the profession at which he aims, he should come to the conclusion to follow his compeers—to practice law or medicine, etc., without Latin or Greek, thus saving, as he supposes, expense of time, labor and money:—nay, even to enter the Church, as so many have done in the capacity of ministers, and are doing, without any classical learning.

It hardly needs to be added that in addition to the reluctance to spend the necessary time, a very large number are unwilling to apply themselves to the inevitable study. In the case of those who come up entirely unprepared, and who have the best possible excuse in the manifest impossibility of their "catching up"—to use their own expressive phrase—since reflection will teach, *as experience has taught* us all, how dry, how wearisome, how harassing must be attendance upon classes, the necessary preliminary instruction being deficient or wanting. How absurd the attempt to explain the doctrine of the gerund and gerundive to a student who has no conception of the difference between a noun and an adjective used as a noun, is palpable to any one who knows grammar; but what the student in such case must suffer (even supposing him to make a fair endeavor, which but few will be found long to attempt) must be left to the imagination. College professors who know their duty and try to perform it, will join me in admitting the intense annoyance to themselves, the irksomeness of the work both to them and the student, and the impossibility to the latter of recovery when "sero medicina paratur." Now the time applied to study at college is an item of no small moment; and we speak the admitted results of experience when we say that even a well-prepared student, during his first three years at our American colleges, ought to spend at least two hours daily on classics alone, to give him any fair prospect of the amount of actual knowledge that he should have on graduation. When it is borne in mind that there are other studies, also of importance, to be pursued, and that each one requires a proportionate amount of study, it will be seen that even on the part of the best students an amount of time and study is required that will absolutely preclude the wasting of time and attention on frivolities; and if this be so, what must be the case of the unprepared lad, who has yet to learn what he should have acquired at the grammar school?

It may indeed well be, and we should judge from indications the fact is, that many of our students come to college as young men used before the war to go to the University of Virginia; not intending to study there, and consequently not proposing to learn anything there, but merely on the general ground that it was the correct thing to have to say, in after life, that they had been at the University, whether they learned anything there or not.

The colleges themselves, too, are in fault for not vigorously repressing the yachting, boating, base-balling and other practices and pursuits which have grown, in the principal institutions of the country, to such an extent that common sense would teach even a casual observer that very little of severe study can be there. The two things cannot coexist; and he who, during two or three months of his college year, itself consisting of but nine months, is busily occupied in training for a rowing match which is to be the great feature of the year, whose whole mind and being are agog on the subject for months beforehand and for weeks after, has no time and less inclination for such trifles as Latin and Greek. What is true of the boating nuisance holds equally good of all the other excitements with which the so-called students fritter away their time, destroy their chances of ever being scholars, and get their names into the trashy papers of the day for performances in which any fair coxswain or stroke-oarsman on board a man-of-war will far enough excel them, and that too on the munificient pay of $18 per month. Do parents and guardians send their sons and wards to college for this purpose? If they must be oarsmen, why not put them on board a vessel, with injunctions that they be of the crew of the gig, barge, cutter, launch, or dingy? It will not be so expensive, they will earn their board and clothes while at it, and there will be no false pretence of education connected therewith. If mere muscular power, or mere muscle, be the desideratum, they might at once be apprenticed to blacksmiths, and might attain at length a measurable proficiency in wielding the ponderous sledge to weld the flukes of a bower anchor. It would seem that students have been before this twitted with truth as having "rung in" (so it is called) professional base-ballers under the guise of students to gain the day. One becomes sad at the silliness, the deception and hollowness of the whole thing; yet newspapers are full of the accounts of such doings, college magnates glory in the success of their man, trustees doubtless applaud, and the parents of the victorious noodle or noodles are in ecstasies. The whole thing is wrong, misplaced, silly, and productive of the most mischievous consequences, and the utter ruin of all educational prospects.

Again, there are too many colleges, or rather institutions going amongst us by that name, which do not even deserve to be called good high schools. Sectarianism in most instances, local pride in others, and the same feeling that impels our villages ofttimes to apply for a charter, to have a mayor and city council, prompts every school of sixty or seventy pupils throughout the country to get a charter, have a faculty, dun the public for aid, confer degrees by wholesale on all the local or denominational small fry who would like to have them. This is absurd. A primary school is not made an academy merely by calling it so, nor can an academy, by any legislation, be turned into a college; neither, if possible, would it be at all desirable. There are too many of them already of their kind, and their members are largely though not entirely in fault for their being what they are, viz: puny, meagre and inefficient attempts at doing on small outlay of brain and means, and with scant numbers, apparatus and other appliances, what can only be done effectively by an able faculty, full libraries, ample chemical and philosophical appliances, the *esprit du corps* arising from large numbers, and the independence and manliness fostered by fixedness of position through scholarships and proportionate ample pay to the members of the faculty. But above all things, care should be taken in the first place to see that no man is put into a position to teach what he does not know! Let it not be in the power of a board of trustees, whose knowledge (if ever possessed) has been obliterated by time and disuse, to appoint men to so important a post as that of professor of Greek or of Latin, who are not competent in either—do not actually know either: and this is unfortunately a thing that has often been done in our country, and even in colleges that rank with the best. It may be thought that such precaution is unnecessary; but let us examine the matter quietly, and see what a professor should be, slightly glancing by the way at what a great many, aye a majority, are. What is said will be proposed in no captious or cynical spirit, but (if the writer knows himself) solely with regard to the truth and the benefit of the rising generation of youth. We use the word *professor* here in its proper acceptation of an instructor in a special branch, at an institution of a high or of the highest grade of its kind. But it will bear in this connection the vulgar and peculiarly American usage, by which any one is a professor who teaches anything, from Sanskrit down to the alphabet; and the remarks made, while primarily intended for collegiate teachers, and especially for those of the classical branches, will apply "mutatis mutandis" to the teachers in all schools and academies where classical studies are ostensibly a prominent object of acquirement.

It may here be stated once for all that what is said is in no respect intended to derogate from the moral character of the class referred to, of those who appoint them, of the community that patronizes them. Probably, nay assuredly, there is no country in the world so little likely to tolerate any deflection from the moral law, or from propriety of demeanor in a teacher, as the United States.

Men are professors in Europe who, on account of grossness of life, of indecorum of personal habits, could not teach in the United States for one week, had they the talents of an archangel. But they are thoroughly learned, they have mastered their branches; so far as anything human can be perfect, they thoroughly know what they teach, how to present it in fresh, interesting and attractive lights; are competent to answer, and promptly and fully respond to and clear up, any question in their branch that may be presented, or difficulty that may be put.

What we need is to have fewer colleges (one say for forty that we have,) and just such professors; retaining always the American desideratum of good character and gentlemanly habits. We want men filling classical chairs who have made those studies a specialty; who have prepared themselves at all points in regard to the niceties of grammar and idiom, the peculiarities of thought and diction, the habits and manners, the constitution, geography, laws, history, antiquities and mythology of Greece and Rome; men not only able to write correctly and with idiomatical accuracy of expression, but competent to converse fluently, and by consequence to think, in the languages they profess to teach. In reality no person without this thoroughness can with any degree of propriety be said to understand a language in such form as to be justifiable in occupying the position referred to in a genuine institution of learning. Such men are even now to be found, we presume, in scanty numbers, in our own country; and they will soon be found in greater numbers under the regime we propose. Under them students will receive an impetus in their studies; what they do will be done well; and the influence of such a teacher, even though his branch be not the favorite one of the student (for every student will have a bias or predilection for a particular study) will last through life.

But what is the fact? Our professors are appointed by family, class, or denominational influences. A prominent preacher, a lawyer not successful at the bar, a physician upon whom patients do not call in paying numbers, an editor of a religious journal, or a compiler of one of the before-mentioned text-books, is chosen; and who would hurt the feelings of gentlemen of such eminence by proposing an examination? Who would be able to do the work of examination, if proposed? Rarely or never those in whose hands the appointment lies: and it is much handier and every way more simple to take for granted that the candidate, who has already been a professional man, and who probably graduated somewhere, knows what he should know, than either to intimate the possibility of doubt, or expose our own ignorance on an actual test.

Ah, gentlemen! here is the great cause of our inferiority in classics (it may be, too, in other things) to the nations of Europe. The subordinate, or rather the primary instructors in classics, are with us either self-constituted (as are the principals of our academies and boarding schools), or when appointed, the power of appointment is lodged in the hands of men incapable of appreciating the subjects to be taught, and the requirements for teaching them. The head master wants not the most thorough and profound teacher, but the cheapest man, and the latter takes the place as a *dernier resort* until he can do better at some other and more lucrative business. It were better that the high-toned feelings of any number of plausible and sleek candidates for professorships were wounded, and that both they should see themselves, and the community should see them, in their true light, than that this persistent sham under the auspices of our colleges and the aegis of their Board of Trustees should go on any longer, fraught as it is with ruin to the best temporal interests of the youth entrusted to their care by an over-confiding, a credulous, and, in this regard, an ignorant community. We know now professors of Latin, and those too of long standing as well as of late appointment, who could no more carry on a conversation in Latin than they could fly in the air; who cannot discern and read with quantity and rhythm a line of Terence, or a prologue of Plautus; nay, who cannot distinguish, if I print in this article five lines of Latin poetry of the simplest measure, whether it be prose or poetry, unless taken from the common college curriculum, and the lines themselves indicate to them the verse. Such a thing as translating *currenti calamo* into Latin the leader that may appear in some of our best papers, is to them as thoroughly impossible as it would be for a Digger Indian, with a slight tincture of frontier English, to understand the same; and in short, their whole knowledge of the tongue is lame, defective, feeble and inaccurate. In a conversation gravely held with one of them, a few months since, he expressed the opinion that "he did not believe that anybody now-a-days could speak Latin," and insinuated, rather than expressed openly, a doubt whether it had ever been done since the time when, as he expressed it, "*Latin became a dead language*." What is to be done with such a man? He has not a sufficient substratum after all these years of teaching Sallust, Virgil, and the few orations of Cicero supposed to be necessary, even to appreciate an argument on the subject, or to have a glimmering conception of his own ignorance. Scripture tells what the result is when the blind lead the blind; and this *cæcus cæcorum ductor* has held forth for many years with great acceptance as professor of Latin! Nor is he alone: he is but a pronounced type of a large class, we fully believe of a majority, if not of college professors, certainly of academical instructors throughout our country. We would in charity hope that it arises from *ignorantia invincibilis*, and would just as soon argue with the hedge schoolmaster (you may possibly have seen the type), who knows usually so little that he supposes that he knows everything, and that wisdom will die with him.

And yet what is it but a fraud? These men pocket, year by year, salaries or fees from the community, for teaching what they do not know, for imparting a knowledge of what they themselves do not understand. If a man sells me an unsound horse at the price of a sound one; if he gets from me money on a check returned "no funds;" if he sells me goods not up to the sample or damaged, I have a remedy at law. Why should I have no remedy in this single case? It may be said that these people who teach languages which they do not know, *i. e.*, can neither write nor speak, act in good faith. I answer that there are means of knowing, and it is their business to know the quality of the article in which they deal, and for which they take my money, and I cannot accept these excuses. There are numbers of men (it is useless to say what proportion of all) teaching classics and making money at it, who if they had their deserts would sit in prison under sentence of false pretense. This may seem a harsh showing, but the proofs might readily be furnished; and no wonder that the cause of classical literature is at a low ebb throughout our country.

If, as those conversant with the subject will fully admit, the best graduates of our most noted colleges are inferior in actual knowledge to a student who passes his examination at a German gymnasium; if an Eton or Rugby boy will shame them in writing Latin or Greek verse; if the students of the various colleges (in the French sense, *i. e.*, high schools) are fully their masters in those studies, surely something ought to be done, some action taken in the premises, or else we had better yield at once. Under the circumstances, and considering the almost entire nullity of the classical knowledge imparted in our country, it is not to be wondered at that men shrewd in other respects, but either entirely wanting classically, or possessing that smattering which is usually imparted and which they feel to be almost utterly useless, have been successful in superseding the study of classics, by substituting what are called "Scientific courses," in many of our foremost colleges; and that really educated Americans traveling or residing in Europe, are obliged to feel ashamed for their country, when the subject of classics is on the *tapis* among literary men. A remedy ought to be found; the talent exists in our youth; some professors can even now be found thoroughly educated to the requirements of the chairs of classics in our colleges; others will soon be educated to that point under their auspices; the system of appointment on general principles and without examination must be done away with, and no one should be allowed to teach in an academy who has not passed, *then and there*, an examination at the hands of *competent* men, on the branches he professes to teach; the number of pseudo-colleges should be largely reduced; boating, yachting, etc.—in short, all the wide-spread occupation of our present muscular-literary aspirants—should either entirely be done away or confined within reasonable limits; which regulation might with great propriety be extended to the whole absurd system of honorary degrees, which are a delusion, and tend to diminish the respect which a degree rightfully taken deserves. The diploma or "sheepskin," as our friends term it, would mean something which it has long since ceased to do in any eyes but those of the illiterate, or the still more stupid class, the half-learned. The evil is one of great gravity, threatening to make total shipwreck of the cause of genuine erudition in our country; and while the writer is well aware that it is the truth which hurts, and that he has said too much for many, he is equally sure that he has with him the sentiments of the really learned, and he knows better than to expect the suffrages of the sciolists and shams who disgrace our country, no difference what their position, if they be ignorant and pretentious, and sail under false colors.

Many more points might be made, many more instances and narratives given, of the fraudulent and false nature of our system of classical education, even among ourselves; and we might be induced to make an introspection of our own colleges, which would not be entirely flattering. For the present, this paper is long already; enough has been said to indicate some of the prominent defects pertaining thereto; and in the hope that this defective sketch may stimulate other minds to thought upon the subject and to the devising of efficacious remedies against its evils, we may speak of our own seminaries, and their aspirants, and their defects, in the future.

T. A. Becker.

THE JESUITS.

Bartoli. History of the Life and Institute of St. Ignatius Loyola, New York (Dunigan & Bro.), 1855. *

It is said of St. Ignatius, the founder of the Jesuits, that he prayed often and earnestly to Heaven, that his Society might never tread the broad path of prosperity, but should always walk in the footsteps of the crucified God-Man, whose name it bears; and that as long as Divine Providence allowed it to exist for the good of the Church, it should be, like Him, a sign to be gainsayed, persecuted, and even crucified by the world. Whether this be literally true or not, it little matters. Certain it is, that such was Ignatius' constant wish; and he often so expressed himself. "Prosperity," he was wont to say, "caused in him more fear than joy; and should the Society cease to be persecuted, he dreaded lest it should become remiss in the observance of regular discipline." Almost the same thing is recorded of Saints Francis Xavier and Francis Borgia, his first disciples, and who inherited most of his spirit. But whether it was actual prayer, or simply the expression of mingled hope and desire on the Saint's part, he was heard on high; and the wish of his heart was given him abundantly, "with full measure and running over." He himself, while preparing the foundations of his order, was made to taste of this bitter chalice of persecution, which he wished to leave as a wholesome portion to his children. He was accused before the Inquisition, and before the ecclesiastical courts of Alcala and Salamanca. Sorcery and

---

* This translation from the Italian of Bartoli is owing to the pen of an estimable American lady, the wife of the Spanish Minister in Washington, M. Calderon de la Barca.

heresy were among the crimes laid to his charge; nor was his innocence always able to shield him from punishment. The tongue of slander even sought to arraign him before the highest tribunal of the Church, that of the Sovereign Pontiff at Rome. And now that he is in Heaven, reaping the reward of his life-long labors, venerated as a Saint, honored and invoked on the altars of the greatest portion of the Christian world, he still serves as a guide to his children, to show them what they must expect at the hands of men here below, down to the very end of time; down to that avenging day of Judgment, when in the words of Holy Writ "*omnis iniquitas oppilabit os suum*" (Ps. cvi. 42); when the slanderers of so many centuries shall stand abashed, self-convicted before the assembled world, and the servants of God shall be justified in the sight of men and angels. For the last three hundred years or more, the name of Ignatius of Loyola has been vilified, his life and actions, aye his very virtues, have been assailed and blackened, by non-Catholic writers; and even those who strive, or flatter themselves and readers with the notion that they are striving, to be impartial, either repeat the old calumnies in milder language, or think it magnanimity to dismiss him with the gentle epithets of "fanatic," "zealot," and "enthusiast."*

And if this has been the lot of the Father, how has it fared with his children? If they resemble him in his zeal, in his working for the glory of God and the salvation of souls, they resemble him too in the reward they have reaped at the hands of the world. Though fighting only with the weapons of the Gospel against the wild spirit of revolt that has possessed Europe for the last three centuries, though preaching submission to lawful authority in church and state, they have been denounced as framers of sedition against both. They have been made the victims of oppression at the hands of kings, ministers of state and parliaments. They have been proscribed in Catholic as well as Protestant countries. They have been murdered by raging mobs, or sent to the scaffold in the name of the law by judicial tribunals. Bishops have thought proper to hurl against them pastorals and ponderous treatises; and almost in our own day, even those whose religious calling should have prompted them to be rivals of the Jesuits only in charity and meekness, have not blushed to praise in Latin inscriptions a brutal autocrat, as "the banisher of the Loyolites." The very Head of the Church, only a hundred years ago, was compelled for the sake of peace to make of them a sacrifice to the insatiate enemies of the Church, and to disband at their bidding the most intrepid defenders of the Holy See and of Christianity. But far worse than spoliation and banishment, worse even than imprisonment and death, has been the cruel warfare of calumny and misrepresentation that has been waged against them from the very first day of their existence; till their very name has become a bugbear in Protestant and infidel ears, and even awakens fear in the hearts of timid and ill-educated Catholics. They are accused of all manner of crimes; they are made to appear not only as workers of iniquity, but as elevating it into a system, and as deliberately constituting themselves its apostles and teachers. Their very name has passed into an odious expression for all that involves fraud, lying and treachery. The term "Jesuit," with its hateful import, has been indelibly impressed upon our language. You will find it not only in the pages of stereotyped religious mountebanks like Fox and Errington—to say nothing of our own ignoble, illiterate flock of American anti-Catholic scribblers—but in the noble prose of grave and staid writers like South, Hall and Milton. Even the Macaulays and Gladstones recognize its potency to wing an anti-Catholic shaft, when they would appeal to vulgar prejudice or insinuate some covert slander against the Church. And now the question presents itself, what have the Jesuits done to deserve this widespread odium? what is there in their institute or in their history to warrant these hateful accusations? Absolutely, nothing, that will bear scrutiny. Who has yet been able to produce a word or a syllable from their Rules to justify these slanderous charges and insinuations?

---

* Instead of looking abroad, though foreign examples abound, we shall quote one from our own country. The late John Quincy Adams—who once sat in the chair made illustrious by Washington, Jefferson and Madison, but who it seems preferred to such glorious reminiscence the subsequent *role* of congressional agitation (we do not care to repeat the odious name wherewith the conservative press of that day used to brand him) and who is still classed amongst American statesmen by some of his admirers—in an oration delivered in 1843 before the Cincinnati Astronomical Society, and subsequently published, deliberately stated, as a fact, that Ignatius of Loyola was the *inventor of the Inquisition!* If our scholars and statesmen (so called) have thus studied history, what are we to expect from the common herd? But as Mr. Adams, or some of his friends on his behalf, when reproached with this ridiculous anachronism, tried to wind and wriggle out of it by a miserable subterfuge, pretending that by the institution invented by Ignatius was meant the Society of Jesuits, we feel bound to give his actual words. After detailing the hardships which Galileo had to undergo from "the Tribunal of the Inquisition" (Mr. Adams' own expression) and at the hands of "the Inquisitor Cardinals" (again his own words), he adds "THE INSTITUTION, by the officers of which Galileo suffered every persecution short of death, which man could inflict upon him, WAS THE INVENTION OF IGNATIUS LOYOLA." To try and make out—solely with the view of covering up a disgraceful blunder—that the legal tribunal, before which Galileo was arraigned, was not the Inquisition, but the Jesuit Society, or that the Jesuits and the Inquisition are one and the same thing, is simply shameful. It is as false as dishonest, and only shows what adepts some of our non-Catholic friends are, in what they love to denounce as "Jesuitism."

And yet it is not so much from the cold, dead letter of these Rules and Constitutions, that we should seek to learn the true spirit of the Jesuit; what he is in daily life and action, what he is in his commerce or conflict with the world. Unless we take into consideration the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius, we shall never understand what a Jesuit really is. It was under their influence that the Society was founded and diffused throughout the world; and Bartoli is right in calling them the basis of the spiritual edifice raised by Ignatius. Every one who enters the Society, has either been moved to take the step by performing the Exercises, or is required to go through them before definitely uniting himself with the Order. He must repeat them frequently on stated occasions; indeed, in some shape or other, they enter into his constant meditation. They furnish the daily food to nourish his soul; and it may truly be said, that from them chiefly he draws his life and spirit. Now what are these Exercises? They are nothing else than a systematized* epitome of gospel truth: the very same truth that changed the face of the Gentile world; that made heroes and heroines even out of illiterate men, shrinking women and helpless children in the early days of Christianity. In these Exercises man is invited, apart from the noise and distractions of the world, to consider first his last end, the service and glory of God, which end he has in common with all the works of the divine hand; and then to reflect on his special end, which is the salvation of his immortal soul. All creatures—which name includes not only material objects, but all our relations to men and things—are called up and passed in review before his eyes; their true nature is pointed out; he is reminded that at best they are only means, never to be confounded with his end. They may be helps, they may be hindrances to that end; and he must use them accordingly, embracing them if they are helping means, discarding them if they thwart his great purpose. To one fully convinced of his true end, and sincerely bent on saving his soul, what are the riches, the glory and honor of this world? What are even its friendships, or other bonds of affection? They are to be measured by the eye of Christian faith; they are good, if they conduce to our true end; wicked and to be cast away, if they withdraw us from it. This is the happy state of what may be called the due equilibration* of a rational mind, which in serving God does not count wealth, honor, or comfort as things good or desirable of themselves, but will accept at His hands with equal readiness either these or their opposites, poverty, shame and suffering, provided they are better means of serving Him. The next step is to weigh well and learn to detest the enormity of sin, which abuses the creature against the Creator, mars the harmony of the universe, and frustrates the true end of man. After this comes the consideration of what it cost our Saviour to atone for sin, and undo the wicked work of Satan in our first parents and in ourselves. And then, deeply impressed with the consciousness of the plague-spots of our fallen nature, its pride, covetousness and sensuality—and contemplating besides the life of humiliation, poverty and suffering, chosen by our Divine Lord as special means of the Atonement—the soul feels encouraged to take a higher step, to rise even above " holy indifference," and after the example of Him who is our Teacher and Model as well as our Saviour, to give the preference to a life of humility and mortification. Here any Christian may rest ratisfied with the result of his meditations; but the Jesuit goes farther. In beholding the perpetual struggle of the Devil, and his ally the World, to destroy the souls that Christ has redeemed, he is moved to holy indignation and zeal; and he begs of Him the privilege of enlisting under His banner, that he too may wage unceasing war upon the Devil and his allied hosts, and may conquer souls to Christ. This is a very brief, inadequate sketch of those holy Exercises which the Order has received as a legacy from its Founder; but it was necessary in order to give some faint idea of the spirit that moves the Jesuit to enrol himself among the soldiers of Christ, and that sustains him in his warfare against the world and its countless forms of sin and error.

---

*It is in this system and skillful arrangement that the power of the Exercises consists; and this it is which makes it widely different from mere knowledge or contemplation of Christian truth. The object of St. Ignatius was "to reduce the cure of the soul to an art by basing upon certain principles of faith an exact and positive method, which practiced by the application of the means prescribed by him, insures almost infallible success. If we reflect seriously upon this, we shall find that this method differs from a simple consideration of the truths of religion as much as a knowledge of the virtues of certain plants or minerals differs from the art of medicine; which by teaching us to understand the constitution of the human body, and the properties of certain substances tending to restore its equilibrium when injured by sickness, forms a body of precepts, by means of which our health may be restored or preserved".—Bartoli, Hist. of St. Ignatius, Chapter V.

But do not the Jesuits make of this pretended zeal only what St. Peter calls "a cloak of malice?" Do they not bind themselves through dreadful vows, by means of which they are organized into a secret society, formidable to states and peoples, or at least utterly incompatible with modern civilization? We reply that the Jesuits are no secret society: the men who thus reproach them do not themselves believe it; and even if they did, such a charge would come with very bad grace from most of their accusers. The whole world knows well to what the Jesuits have solemnly pledged themselves; and their daily lives and true history are open to all, so that none may plead ignorance of how they have carried out their pledges. But, is not the real objection to these very pledges or vows, so openly taken? Were men of the world disposed to answer with some slight degree of candour, would they not speak their mind somewhat in this strain—"Yes: we do object to these Jesuit vows, and we look upon them with disgust and aversion. Such things may have done for monastic and mediæval times; but they are out of place in our enlightened century. And, if they are to be tolerated at all, let them be confined to the cloisters, where silly women and half-witted men immure themselves in solitude, and wisely refrain from obtruding themselves on the gaze of the world. But these Jesuits will not so hide themselves; they do not shrink from the eyes of men. They go everywhere; they make themselves at home, even in communities where civilization has reached its highest point, and where the prevailing spirit is non-Catholic or infidel; they walk about at noon-day, displaying—if not ostentatiously, yet unpleasantly—those remnants of antiquated superstition that most offend the enlightened mind of our day."

---

*It is styled "indifference," or "holy indifference" in the technical language of the Spiritual Exercises.

No doubt, if the Jesuits, forgetful of their vocation, would only consent to hide their light under a bushel; if they would but cut themselves off from the world by a life of total seclusion; if they devoted themselves solely to singing the praises of God and to saving their own souls, the World, the Flesh and the Devil would think much better, or less evil of them. But when, on the contrary, they issue from their quiet abodes, and with calm courage proceed to defy and attack error and vice in their strongholds, to preach in their discourses and exemplify in their persons before the world the distasteful virtues of poverty, humility and chastity, it is no wonder that they are hated and reviled, and, like the Infant Church, everywhere "spoken against."*

If the spirit of the age, the spirit of this world—which "is seated in wickedness," which hates the disciples as it once hated the Master, and which has already been judged† and condemned in the person of its prince—had not so thoroughly possessed the minds of most men, darkening their understandings and corrupting their hearts, we should have no need of perpetually reminding those, at least, who call themselves Christians and profess to draw their knowledge of Christian truth and morality from the New Testament, that there are such Christian virtues as poverty, chastity and obedience; and that these virtues, when raised to the degree of perfection, embody what are called the Evangelical Counsels. We should feel ashamed to add even another word in explanation or defence of these Counsels; and it ought to be unnecessary. But, unfortunately, it is not; and we feel the sad conviction, that their meaning is not understood by one in every fifty of our American brethren, even the well-educated, outside of the Church. For amongst them is fearfully verified that saying of the Psalmist "*Diminutæ sunt veritates a filiis hominum.*" (Ps. xi. 2.)

---

*This, too, was the experience of their holy Founder. "He was once surprised with a sad and depressed countenance, a circumstance astonishing in a man whose impassible physiognomy always indicated the profound peace of his soul. He was in fact afflicted, because he observed that in a certain province the affairs of the Society went forward with too much tranquillity, and that its members enjoyed equally the favor of the court and of the people. Ignatius judged from his own experience. When he was solely occupied with the care of his own soul, and his own progress in perfection, no one thought of ill-treating him; on the contrary, he was venerated as a Saint but was he occupied with his neighbor, they took up arms against him, and he soon found accusers, imprisonment and chains; he was treated as a seditious disturber of the peace, and ordered to be silent. "You enjoy a long truce," said one of his friends to him in Paris, when the Saint, who as yet knew French but little, could not labor for the salvation of souls. "It is true," replied he; "the world grants me a truce, because I do not make war upon it; but let me once come out of the camp, and you will see Paris up in arms against me." Bartoli, Life of St. Ignatius. Ed. cit., vol. I., p. 225.

† John xv. 18; xvi. ii: I John v. 19.

These Counsels, as their name implies, are not matters of law or precept, but are given by way of advice and counsel to those who wish to become perfect in the practice of virtue and in the following of Christ. The Christian virtues are binding on all. To be poor in spirit, clean of heart, charitable to the needy, is necessary for all; men and women, young and old, rich and poor, clergy and laity. But it is not expected of all, that they should sacrifice their whole store for the benefit of the poor; that they should of their own accord raise up a sacred barrier between themselves and the innocent joys of domestic life; that they should devote their whole being to the service and relief of destitute or suffering humanity. This is the privilege of a few chosen souls, who aspire to something higher in the service of God than falls to the lot of common mortals; who are prompted by divine impulse to rise above the beaten path, to lift themselves from our common earth and soar aloft; who can truly say with the poet, but with far worthier aim and nobler inspiration :—

Tentanda via est, quâ me quoque possim
Tollere humo.

These are they, whose hearts give ready entrance to God's grace, and are effectually stirred by its gentle pleadings to receive with welcome and delight the invitation of the great Teacher, "Be you perfect, as also your Heavenly Father is perfect". (Math. v. 48.) In these words it is no longer Patriarch or Prophet, nor Saint of the Old or New Law, but the Holiness of the Divine Nature—a holiness without end or limit—that is given us as the standard for our imitation. And there never have been wanting in the world, from the first days of Christianity, those who heard and obeyed this heavenly summons to perfection, or to the ceaseless striving after it. Some of them died in their quiet cell; others in the gloom of a dungeon; not a few of them by the ignominious hand of the executioner. But their memory is in blessing; and that glory before men, which they shunned during life, has become their portion after death. They wrought wonderful things in their zeal and charity, for the glory of God and the welfare of their fellow-men. They were benefactors of mankind; and the good they have done their race far exceeds all that can be claimed for Pagan and worldly heroes, for the sages and legislators of ancient or modern times. Their names will be remembered and cherished by faithful, loving hearts, long after those of the Cæsars, Napoleons, Cavours and Bismarcks shall have faded away from the memory of man. Nor should it be forgotten that it was principally from this class—the Jesuits, so to call them, of early Christianity—that Divine Providence chose the holy and great men who under God called our barbarian forefathers out of the darkness of heathenism into the marvelous light of Christian truth and knowledge; that kept alive in their cells the torch of science during the ages of darkness; that reclaimed the waste spots and deserts of great part of Europe; that gave her all that is wise and Christian in her laws and institutions; that were the real founders of whatever there yet remains of good and valuable—in a word, all that is yet undepraved and unheathenized—in the civilization of Europe and America.

Those men who make profession of Christianity, and ignore or deride the Evangelical Counsels, have either never read the Gospel, or have forgotten its teachings; or what is too often the case with those who are loudest in denouncing "the traditions of men," have learned their Christianity, not from God's holy, unadulterated Word, but from those very "traditions" of fallible men, which they affect to despise. It is impossible to peruse with the slightest degree of attention the Gospel narrative, or the Epistles of the Apostles, and not find there these Counsels clearly laid down, and not only praised but warmly recommended to Christians for practice. Perfect chastity, self-denial, mortification, fasting, voluntary austerities; the taking up of our cross of our own accord, instead of waiting till Providence lay it on our unwilling shoulders; the renouncing of father, mother, brother, sister, and all worldly goods, the more readily to follow Christ—surely, these are all sayings with which every reader of the Gospel should be well acquainted, and even the unlettered who hear them read occasionally, though seldom made the topic of a discourse, from the sectarian pulpit.

But unhappily the great change which came over the European world three or more centuries ago, has ruthlessly blotted out, not only what some are pleased to call the dross and superstitions of mediæval Christianity, but the very spirit and substance of Christ's religion, as taught in the Gospel. Some of its forms may yet linger among those who, outside of the true Church, still call themselves Christians. But the life, the soul has gone, and mere lifeless forms must soon share the same fate. That violent change, like all resolutions forced upon unwilling peoples, sought to delude its victims with the prestige of a high-sounding name, and dignified itself with the title of Reformation—a reformation of the Church of Christ in doctrine and morals. And this is the name it still bears, with awful mockery of the truth, among those who—whatever the extent of their knowledge or their fears and suspicions—are naturally loath to condemn the work of their fathers. For how could we expect men who adhere even nominally to a religious system of human origin, to do strict historical justice to the founders and framers of that system? Dryden, as accurately as happily, suggested the name of *Deformation* for that lamentable rebellion, which robbed Europe of her religious unity, and made in her body social and politic a helpless breach through which

"*deformed* rout
Entered, and foul disorder,"

never perhaps to be wholly remedied until the day of God's final judgment. But a far truer and more expressive name was given to the great religious convulsion of the sixteenth century, by one of keen insight, who, being neither Catholic nor Protestant, may be looked on as an impartial judge, and who ranks high in the Protestant and liberal world among the apostles and poets of modern progress. We mean Heyne.* He hails and applauds Luther's rebellion against the Church as the great "EMANCIPATION OF THE FLESH." Never was there uttered a truer word; never could the results, the so-called "blessings" of the Reformation, have been condensed into a simpler or shorter formula. It is too plain to be misunderstood. In the dark ages of Europe, the Church sought to hold the flesh in subjection to the spirit. But a brighter day dawned; a deliverer came in the person of Martin Luther, and the flesh was emancipated from this shameful, irrational bondage. Let some praise him, if they will, as the discoverer of that consoling doctrine—salvation through faith in Christ alone, without the aid of saints or good works. Let others boast of his having purified Christianity by disentangling it from the traditions of men, or of having freed the human intellect and conscience from the tyranny of the Pope. These, if not shams, are at best mere side issues. Luther's true glory, and the direct, slow but sure, effect of his great work, was the rescue of the Flesh from the slavery in which, under the teaching of the Catholic Church, it was held by the Spirit. Such is Heyne's view of the Reformation; and it is, it must be admitted, philosophically and historically correct. We do not pretend, for a moment, that Luther either avowed openly, or acknowledged to himself, that such was likely to be the result of his labors. It is to be hoped and presumed, that he did not even dimly foresee it at the beginning of his career. But nevertheless it was undeniably the logical sequence of his principles and system; and when in after years he found vice and immorality daily gaining ground, he was forced to admit that this evil growth was springing up everywhere side by side with the growth of the new Gospel. He wept and groaned in bitterness of soul at the sad discovery; he stormed and thundered in his own rough, fiery strain of eloquence.[*] But it was too late. The foul spirit would not down at the bidding of the conjurer who had raised him. Luther's eyes were opened; but pride, self-love, and above all the new habits of life by which he was enchained, would not allow him to think of falling back on the doctrines of the Church he had so long and so passionately derided and denounced. He did not or would not see that it was his own wild theories about good works, and mainly his shameful invectives against the Evangelical Counsels that had brought about this frightful state of morals. How significant is the name of "Fifth Evangelist," given him by some of his unreflecting flatterers? He was, indeed, the herald of a fifth Gospel; but it was a new one, and of his own making: not the Gospel taught by Christ on the plains of Judea; not the Gospel committed to writing from His lips, and preached to the world by the Evangelists, Apostles and Disciples.

---

* Heyne was born of Israelite parents, but he certainly never followed their religion. He lived and died a member of no church, though in his testament (made public after his death by his brother) he calls himself a member of the Lutheran Confession; to which, from some motive connected perhaps with his civil or social interests, he had, in early life, given a nominal adhesion.

Yet if there be anything clearly and explicitly laid down in the New Testament, it is the existence of two beings, as it were, in each of us, forever warring with each other, the sensual[†] and the spiritual man. The former is most frequently symbolized under the name of the *flesh*, the latter under that of the *spirit.* "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh" (Gal. v. 17); that is to say, they are deadly enemies struggling for the mastery of our souls, and one or the other must rule. We cannot serve both, any more than a man can serve two masters or fight in two hostile camps at one and the same time. The flesh implies not only what are strictly called carnal desires, but all besides in our inferior nature that contradicts right reason and God's law. The spirit is, so to speak, our higher and better nature, whatever of our former glorious being has been left unruined or has been restored through Christ; but above all, the impulse of the Holy Spirit working through grace in our hearts. The Apostle tells us[*] that the wisdom of this world, which is born of the flesh, is an enemy to God ; and that whereas the wisdom of the spirit is life and peace, the wisdom of the flesh is death. And again he warns us, that those who are in the flesh[†] cannot please God, but must die; yet, if by the spirit they mortify the deeds of the flesh, they shall live.

---

[*] He even went so far as to doubt, whether it would not be better for him to stop preaching, since it only made men daily more obdurate, more sharp-witted and envenomed. "Ich habe oft gedacht, ich wollte das Predigen gar anstehen lassen; denn die Leute werden täglich härter, spitziger und giftiger draus" (Auslegung des Evang. Johannis. Walch vii., 2467). He declares that he never would have begun to preach his doctrine, had he but known the misery, dissensions, scandals, blasphemy and wickedness that were to come of it. "Wer wollte auch angefangen haben zu predigen, wenn wir zuvor gewusst hätten, das so viel Unglück, Rotterei, Aergerniss Lästerung, Undank und Bosheit sollte darauf folgen?" (In the same commentary Walch viii., 564.) And again, in his commentary on the Prophets, "Wenn mir nun Gott nicht die Augen zugeschlossen hätte, und ich hätte diese Aergernisse vorher geschen, so hätte ich nimmermehr angefangen, das Evangelium zu lehren." (Ausleg. der Propheten. Walch vi., col. 920.)

[†] In St. Paul Ep., 1 Cor. ii. 14, where our Douay Bible has, not incorrectly, "the *sensual* man," the Greek original has *Ψυδικὸς δε ἀνθρωπος*, and the Latin Vulgate

If, then, mortification be the duty of all who wish "to live," that is to save their souls, how much more is it necessary for those who strive after perfection; who in the great battle of the inward life are not content with escaping defeat, with barely holding their own, but aspire to victory—to the complete conquest and subjugation of the lower nature, so that Christ alone may reign in their soul, and His Holy Spirit dwell in their body as in His chosen temple. This is what the Scripture[‡] calls being dead to sin and self, and alive only to God and His righteousness; dead to this world and living a life that is hidden with Christ in God; having so to say no life of our own, but allowing Christ our Lord to live in us instead of ourselves. They who would follow Christ more closely resolve not only to abstain from sin, as all are bound to do, but to flee even its remotest approaches. Hence they take refuge in the Evangelical Counsels, and bind themselves by a religious obligation to shun all that, however lawful in itself, is liable to misuse, or

---

"Animalis autem homo." According to the best lexicographers, the primary meaning of Ψυχικος is "ad animum vel *animam* pertinens." Its secondary meanings are (1) *vitalis;* (2) *animosus*, cupiditatibus serviens; (3) *naturalis.* Hence, since Ψυχη is the *anima*, i. e. *anima sentiens*, the Vulgate rendering is the closest, and therefore the best. King James', and Luther's Bible, from whom Kenrick and Allioli do not dissent, have "the natural man." Wicliffe translates, expressively enough but rather harshly, "the beestli man." Martini in his Italian version judiciously follows the Vulgate (l'uomo animale).

[*] Rom. viii. 6, 7, 8, 13.

[†] That is "live according to the flesh," as explained in a subsequent verse (v. 13).

[‡] Rom. vi. 11; 1 Peter ii. 24; Coloss. iii. 3; Gal. ii. 20.

might in any way serve to detach them from their lofty purpose. And hence arose the sacred vows of continence, poverty and obedience, which are the best safeguards against sensuality, covetousness and pride. These are the three sources from which, as St. John teaches,* springs all the moral evil that leads man astray and works the loss of his soul. The practice of these counsels is good and pleasing to God, and should be honorable before men, whether carried out by the hermit in the desert, the Trappist in his lonely cell, or the Jesuit in the face of the world. It is as much needed now as it was in the middle ages; it is good and expedient in communities where religious error and infidelity abound, no less than in countries like the Tyrol and Ireland, where the simplicity of Christian Faith is so deeply rooted in the soul, that neither brute force nor cunning policy has been able to extirpate it. It is a visible proof that the hand of the Lord is not shortened; that in every time and place the Spouse of the Holy One of Israel must necessarily bring forth fruits of holiness. If nothing else, it is a living, perpetual protest on the part of the Catholic Church against the ignorance or utter forgetfulness of Gospel truth prevaling among those who, defying her authority, presume to call themselves enlightened Christians, owning no guide or teacher outside of Holy Scripture.

But, leaving out of consideration what the Jesuits have in common with the monastic orders, have they not (so say their enemies) a special, frightful vow of obedience to their superior? Does not every Jesuit solemnly pledge himself to do whatever he is bidden by that superior; and in so doing to sacrifice everything—feelings, opinions, convictions and even conscience itself? must he not be, in the hands of him to whom he has sworn obedience, no longer a free, intellectual, moral agent, but a mere tool; a lifeless instrument moved and wholly directed by another's will; a dead body (and here they make a show of quoting textually from the Constitutions of the Order) that has no soul, no power of its own, but obeys blindly the given impulse, is unresistingly raised up, carried about, or dashed to earth by the hands or at the beck of another? And does not all this involve a slavery degrading to human nature; and which leads, or may lead, to the commission of every crime? We answer that this is not the language of sober inquiry, but mere declamation, intended to gratify prejudice and conceal or distort the truth.

In the first place, the vow of obedience, taken by the Jesuits, is common to all Religious Orders, old and new; and the indignation wasted on St. Ignatius and his disciples might as well be turned against the Benedictines or the children of St. Francis and St. Dominic.* We do not deny that St. Ignatius wished the obedient Religious to be in the hands of his Superior "like a dead body" (*perinde ac cadaver*).† But neither can we see that this figurative language, which has evoked so many a sneer, needs any apology. For, in what does it differ from all that has been taught in the school of Christian perfection, from the very first ages of the Church? Such is the doctrine of the great Saints Augustine, Jerome, Basil, John Climacus, Benedict, Bernard, Francis of Assisi; of Thomas a Kempis, and all the renowned masters of the Spiritual Life.‡ Nay, the very expression, for which St. Ignatius is reproached, had been used three centuries before by the Founder of another Religious Order. St. Francis of Assisi used to liken the true Religious to a lifeless body (*corpus exanime*), which is passive in the hands of another;§ and often, while insisting on the perfection of obedience, would exclaim that he wished his children and disciples, in doing the will of their Superior, to resemble dead rather than living men, "*mortuos non vivos ego meos volo.*" And nearly eight centuries before St. Francis, John Cassian, the friend of St. Chrysostom and of St. Leo the Great, made use of the same figure to express what perfect obedience should be. The illustrious St. Basil compares true Religious to sheep, who never dispute the will of the shepherd, but blindly follow whithersoever he leads them. He further adds, that whoever wishes to advance in virtue, to build up (as he says) to perfection the spiritual edifice, must be as pliable as a tool or instrument in the hands of a carpenter or house-builder, which never chooses for itself how it is to be used, never refuses to obey the impulse of the master's hand.* Is this in any way different from "the staff wielded at will" of St. Ignatius? If the language of the latter is exaggerated or wrong, we have no alternative but to reject and condemn the Christian ethics of the fifteen centuries that went before him.

---

* "For all that is in the world, is the concupiscence of the flesh, and the concupiscence of the eyes, and the pride of life." I John ii. 16.

---

* There is substantially no difference between the obedience inculcated by St. Ignatius and that prescribed in other Orders. If any can be thought of, it will be found perhaps to consist in this, that St. Ignatius, while warmly insisting on the perfect spirit of obedience as the life and soul of his Society, yet did not push the limit of its extent as far, as other religious legislators. "S. Ignace (says the calm and judicious Ravignan) a beaucoup insistè sans doute sur la vertu et la perfection de l' obeissance; mais il n'a rien dit de plus fort, ni meme d' aussi fort que les autres fondateurs de societes religieuses. .... Dans cette langue de moderation et de prudence qu' il savait si bien parler, il a cru devoir temperer le conseil de l' obeissance aveugle (coeca quadam obedientia), là ou les autres, tous les autres, l' imposent avec une rigueur qui n' admet point de menagement, avec une etendue qui ne connait point de limites." De l' Existence et de l' Institut des Jesuites, par le R. Pere de Ravignan. Namur, 1844, p. 92.

†"Et sibi quisque persuadeat, quod qui sub obedientia vivunt, se ferri ac regi a divina providentia per superiores suos sinere debent, perinde ac si cadaver essent." Constit., part vi., ch. 1, § 1. (And let each one rest assured, that those who live under obedience ought to allow themselves to be moved and ruled by Divine Providence through their Superiors, as though they were lifeless bodies). To this comparison he subjoins another, that of a staff in the hands of an aged man, which he wields at will.

‡ We have no space to give their language. Any one desirous of reading the passages may find them collected by Suarez in his admirable Treatise de Religione. (Lib. iv. chap. xv.) Paris, 1866. Vol. 17, p. 727.

§ "Tolle corpus exanime et, ut placuerit, pone; videbis non repugnare motum, non murmurare situm, non reclamare dimissum. Quod si statuatur in cathedra, non alta sed ima respiciet; si collocetur in purpura, duplo pallescit. Sic autem verus obediens est, qui cur dimoveatur, non dijudicat; ubi locetur, non curat; ut transmutetur, non instat; evectus ad officium solitam tenet humilitatem etc." St. Bonaventure in Vita S. Francisci, Chap. vi., § 77. Apud Bollandianos ad. d. iv. Oct., p. 757.

But does the obedience of the Jesuit degrade the dignity of human nature? If there exist at all any such Christian virtue as obedience, the answer is very plain. If a low or middling degree of virtue does not degrade a man, much less can a higher degree succeed in so doing. Human nature, or fallen man, has retained very little, indeed, of his former dignity; and that little is not improved by individual self-government or independence. On the contrary, the spirit of insubordination and self-control is one of the chief results of our fall through disobedience; a remnant of the poison infused into our nature by the deadly fruit which our first parents ate in Paradise. Of the three fatal enemies engendered in us by the primeval curse, pride is perhaps the worst. It is, even in the just, generally the last to be subdued. The renouncing of all wealth, be it little or much, and habitual absence from the busy haunts of life and the cares of the world, may bring the mind at last to a practical conviction of the truth of our Lord's doctrine, that riches are thorns and may become snares for the soul, (Luke viii. 14). Continued bodily austerities may dampen and stifle, or the winter of age may extinguish† utterly the fires of fleshly lust. But neither mortification, nor lapse of years, nor withdrawal from the world, will always kill what the Apostle calls "the pride of life" (1. John ii. 16). The history of the Church is full of examples, to prove that no austerity of life, no detachment from worldly goods, is a safeguard against spiritual pride. A hundred names will occur to every Catholic student, from Tertullian in the second century down to the French confessors of the faith, who in the days of Pius VII. fell into the "Blanchardist" schism.‡ We need say nothing of the Arnauds, Pascals and mere-Angeliques of two hundred years ago, in whom an irreproachable outward life was united with a diabolical pride, that drove them to "make shipwreck concerning the faith," (1. Tim. i. 19). The safest and surest remedy against pride is obedience. It implies the renouncing of one's inner self, which is far harder than renouncing what is our own, but outside of us*. And the same Divine Teacher, who said that He will acknowledge as His perfect disciple none "who doth not renounce all that he possesseth," has not failed to inculcate the *denying* and *hating of ourselves*, which means the conquest of our pride and self-love, (Luke. xiv. 33, 26; Matth. xvi, 24). And this is precisely what the Jesuit tries to do by his vow of obedience†.

---

*Constit. Monast. Chap. xxii. Opp. S. Basilii. Paris 1618. Tom. ii., pp. 718–19.

†Constit. Monast. Cap. xxii. Opp. S. Basilii. Paris 1618. Tom. ii. pp. 718–19.

‡Any English reader who wishes to see a condensed account of this politico-religious, trouble, into which even some good men were drawn at the beginning, will find it in Husenteth's Life of Bp. Milner, who wrote against these schismatics.

When their enemies talk of this as being a "slavish" vow, they either know not of what they speak, or they are measuring the Jesuits by their own standard. And this, however docile or humble he may be, no Jesuit will or can submit to. When these men of the world obey—and obey they must at times—they are always prompted by some motive of the baser sort. It is with them only stern necessity or sordid interest; they dread the power or court the favor of the man whom they obey. And this is, indeed, mean and slavish. But the Jesuit obeys through love, of his own free will, with a high, holy purpose. Our enlightened men of the world obey MAN, in as much as he is man. But the Jesuit is of nobler mould. He scorns to obey man as such; but deems it his highest glory to obey GOD, whether He speak in person, or through His lawfully constituted representatives. And these he never would obey, did he not feel sure that thereby he is obeying God, whom alone he considers entitled to claim his obedience.‡ So that even on the score of upholding "the dignity of human nature" it would seem that Jesuit obedience, compared with the obedience of this world, has the best of it.

---

*It is no harm to repeat here those words of St. Gregory the Great, with which all who recite the Divine Office must be familiar: "Fortasse laboriosum non est homini relinquere sua; sed valde laboriosum est relinquere semetipsum. Minus quippe est, abnegare quod habet; valde antem multum est, abnegare quod est." Hom. xxxii. in Evangel.

†In order to obtain more perfectly this self-denial, to ground himself still more deeply in the love and practise of Christian humility, to shield himself yet more securely from the subtle approaches of self-love, lurking under cover of what might be regarded as not unlawful ambition, the professed Jesuit takes an additional vow, never to seek and never to accept any ecclesiastical dignity whatsoever. And the small number of Jesuits to be found amongst the Cardinals, Bishops and other prelates of the Church for the last three centuries, is sufficient proof how well and faithfully they have kept this vow, on which their holy Founder laid such stress, and from which nothing but an absolute command of the Pope can release them. The Jesuit may be "*ambitious*," and Protestants are very fond of adding the epithet, when they have occasion to mention his name; but they must grant that he has a very strange way of showing it.

‡This is the constant teaching of St. Ignatius: Nunquam intueantur personam ipsam cui obediunt, sed in ea Christum Dominum CUJUS causa obediunt. (Epist. de Obedientia). (Let them never regard the person of him whom they obey: but in him (let them behold) Christ our Lord, for WHOSE sake they yield obedience.) Suarez commenting on this passage, gives the logical explanation "non judicat (subditus) praeceptum superioris esse divinum, id est, a Deo ipso immediate latum, cum evidens illi sit hominem esse qui præest'; sed judicat rationem obediendi esse divi-

To say, that by his obedience the Jesuit ceases to be an intellectually and morally free agent, is simply a misuse of words. Whatever surrender is made of his own opinion, does not in the least destroy the participation of the intellect in his action. Whenever obedience is a virtue, it is of necessity under the control of prudence as all virtues must be. Now the Jesuit judges, and judges prudently, that he should obey. The only difference is, that the prudential principle which influences his conduct lies not exactly in his own intellectual investigation, but is external rather, viz., the judgment of the superior, in which he has every reason to acquiesce.* We can see nothing singular in this. It is done every day without reproach by all classes of society; by children in regard to their parents, by the simple and uneducated with respect to the learned. When we go to consult a professional man, it is generally with the predetermination to shape our judgment according to his. And even the world calls this prudence.† Or, to take an example of a higher kind: a man is called on to believe some doctrine that appears to contradict, or which certainly transcends his habitual sphere of thought; he unhesitatingly rejects it, if it be sustained by no evidence; or he accepts it, if proposed on God's authority. He then believes; but the principle that determines his judgment of assent, he does not seek within himself. He has to find it outside of him, in the divine veracity. Yet in this he cannot be accused of blind submission or intellectual slavery. He uses his intellect as fully, and judges as prudently, as when upon examina-

---

nam, scilicet, voluntatem Dei quae impletur, cum impletur superioris voluntas, et esse debet prima ratio obediendi." Loc. cit. p. 783. "The inferior does not judge that the *precept* of his superior is divine, that is, coming immediately from God himself, since it is plain to him that the superior is only a man; but he judges that the *reason of his obeying* is divine, namely the will of God, which is fulfilled in fulfilling the will of the Superior. And this must be the primary ground for obeying." And the same principle (though Protestants seem to forget it) had been taught long before by St. Paul (Eph. vi. 7). "Doing service, as to God, and not to men." And our High-Church friends should remember how fond they are, for a purpose of their own, of quoting the words of another Ignatius, when he exhorts Christians to "obey their Bishop and look up to him as one ruling in place of God." Ep. ad. Smyrn. Cap. 8; ad Magnes. Cap. 6.

* 'Hoc est ei (obedientiæ) proprium quod judicium prudentiale dirigens illam fundatur magis in extrinseco principio et judicio superioris quam in proprio; et ideo, quatenus excludit proprium, dicitur obedientia coeca; excludit autem proprium quatenus vitiosum aut imperfectum est, non quatenus dicit omnem usum proprii intellectus." Suarez, lib. cit. pag. 789.

†Of course, these examples are alleged only to illustrate the general principle, that in many cases we may safely adopt the judgment of another as our own. The mainspring of religious obedience is, not the conviction that the superior is wiser than ourselves, but the certainty that God speaks and commands through him.

tion he decides that the thinking principle within him is spirit, and not matter.

"But the Jesuit," they say, "debases himself by throwing away his freedom, his natural birthright." Moral bonds, as we are taught by the wisest philosophers, regulate and make perfect, but do not destroy human freedom. Is it not absurd to suppose that God by His law should destroy the freedom, of which He is the author? Free will, as it now exists on earth, is not simply a pure and unmixed good. It involves defect or evil; and this is healed by law, whether given us by God, or voluntarily imposed upon ourselves in His name and after His example. It is only in Heaven where men can do no wrong, that freedom becomes perfect. And even now, under the sweet yoke of the Gospel, under the mild bondage —if you will call it so—of the Evangelical Counsels, there is far more true liberty, than in the freest commonwealth of the world. Is it possible, that any man in his right mind can assert, or even insinuate that all moral curbs and restraints are so many outrages on human freedom, so many encroachments on "our birthright," as they are pleased to call it? If so, they are lineal descendants of the fool reproved by holy Job (xi. 12) "who is lifted up into pride, and thinketh himself born free like a wild ass's colt." This frolicsome, riotous beast, to its sorrow if not to its conviction, may be taught at last by the maternal bite, by the heels of its playfellows, by the toils, or it may be the spear of the hunter, that there are limits to its fancied "birthright."

But our men of the world, though they have only too often at the tip of their tongue such phrases as "liberty," "man's inalienable birthright," and the like, are wiser in their generation than their prototype of the desert; and feel no reluctance in shifting their opinions to suit circumstances. The obedience, which they affect to condemn or deride in the Jesuit, they admire and sternly exact in the soldier and in the politician. The soldier represents the triumph of brute force, the putting down of the weak by the strong; too often the crushing of right by injustice, the seizure of provinces and the exaction of tribute, the agonies of strong men and the wailing of helpless women. To accomplish this noble purpose, the soldier's blind obedience is worthy of all praise, and any infraction of its strict laws must be punished by court-martial and a file of musketeers. But if a Jesuit venture to obey voluntarily his superior for God's sake, the better to save his own soul and serve his fellow-men, he is forthwith a craven, a miscreant, one that ought to be accounted, like the primitive Christian, an enemy of mankind. What shall we say of the politicians, that choicest or, at least, most important product of our American civilization? With liberty and independence forever on his lips, in the glorious struggle for place and plunder, he is more afraid of the party lash than of the stings of conscience or the vengeance of his Maker. Indeed for honor, good repute, conscience, or God, he cares nothing; though at times, with hateful hypocrisy, he may raise the battle-cry of religion for electioneering purposes. Neither his opinions nor his actions are his own. He must think, speak and vote as the party bids him. How many months have gone by, since we listened to some of our so-called legislators excusing their late infamous votes on the wretched plea, that they were unwilling to do wrong, but were compelled to it by the party leaders? And it is just such bare-faced men, and their admirers, that habitually turn up their hands in horror at the self-abasement of the Jesuit in keeping vows of obedience, that have no other object than to remove him, as far as possible, from all danger of evil-doing! Or do these men really believe that it is wrong and cowardly to obey for God's sake the just behests of one man, but quite right and honorable to stifle conscience at the bidding of a many-headed monster, because it happens to bear the high-sounding name of "the Party" or the "DEMOS?"

There remains another objection. Does not this solemn vow of Jesuit obedience, or may it not at least, lead to the commission of crime? And is not one who is bound to do whatever he is commanded, and to resign his own will and judgment into the hands of his superior, very likely to become the instrument of any and every misdeed? Let us try, if possible, to imagine good faith in those who put forward this objection, and answer it accordingly.

In the first place the accusation, if honestly made, rests on a misconception. It supposes that the Jesuit vow of obedience is unlimited and unconditional. But such is not the case. That vow has clearly defined limits. It can only hold good in *honesta materia;* in that which is good intrinsically, or which, being of itself indifferent, becomes good in virtue of the precept. But nothing can ever become good that is intrinsically wrong, that is contrary to the law of God, as known through the moral teaching of Christianity. There is, therefore, no danger that the Jesuit in obeying should become the instrument of evil-doing; for nothing sinful can ever become good, were it commanded by men or angels. If the Jesuit received such a command, his vow would no longer bind him; or rather it would bind him to disobey. For, unlike the men of the world who slander him, it is the privilege of the Jesuit to obey God alone, and not man; and were he told to do anything manifestly wrong, he would know at once that it was no longer God, but mere man, who gave such command. This is the express doctrine of St. Ignatius, who wishes his children to "render obedience in all things in which there appears no sin."* And this he explains elsewhere with other terms "in all things to which, consistently with charity, obedience may be extended."† *Charity* is here used in in its higher sense, as meaning the love of God. But to obey a sinful precept is not compatible with charity or the love of God; and therefore, according to the Saint, the obedience of the Jesuit can only be allowed in what is good and pleasing to God. Such has been the theological teaching of the Catholic Church from her very beginning, and none have insisted on it more than those Saints and Doctors who have been most outspoken in their praises of perfect obedience.‡ The Jesuit, then, runs no risk in vowing to obey. Though willing to sacrifice his opinion in indifferent matters for the sake of obedience, he is, generally speaking, as good a judge of what is sinful or not as his superior; and there is as little danger that the latter will urge, as that the other will accept, any obligation to do what contradicts God's law. The possibility of such evil is simply a product of the fertile brain of anti-Catholic credulity, and has no warrant in fact or history. How often, we may ask, within the last three hundred years or more, has it happened, that a Jesuit has been called on to oppose the voice of conscience or the law of God, to a wicked command on the part of his superiors? Is this the experience—uttered by word of mouth, or recorded in print—of those who have left the Society of Jesuits, and spoken and written against their former colleagues? Has the Jesuit-hating world ever heard of such a case? Or has anything like it been invented even by the Foxes and other fablers of Protestantism, old or new; or by those unequalled masters of the lying art, the Jansenists? And yet how thrilling and romantic would be the story of a young Jesuit, torn from his first love and immured in a convent by his bigoted father—remaining unstained by the contagion that surrounded him—protected perhaps by the furtive reading of a Bible cautiously hid away in some recess of his cell—and, fresh from its perusal, confronting his superior and repelling his iniquitous behests with a stern appeal to the Gospel of Christ! Romantic, indeed! But, God be blessed! there is a Providence that controls lying tongues, as well as corrupt hearts and impious hands.

---

* "In omnibus rebus, ubi peccatum non cerneretur." Constit., cap. i., § 23.

† "In omnibus rebus, ad quas potest obedientia cum charitate se extendere." Ibid., P. V., cap. i. In the official explanation (Declarat. lit. B) these words have the following gloss appended:" "Hujusmodi sunt illæ omnes, in quibus nullum manifestum est peccatum." (Such are all those things, in which no sin plainly appears.)

‡ A few extracts will sufficiently prove our assertion. St. Basil, in his Monastic Constitutions, Cap. 23, from which we have already quoted, says: "Cultores pietatis moderatores suos sequi debent, nihil omnino ipsorum jussa curiosius perscrutantes, QUANDO LIBERA SUNT A PECCATO" ("Those who follow after piety must obey their superiors, and not scrutinize closely their commands, *whenever these include no sin.*") St. Bernard says, "Quidquid vice Dei praecipit homo, QUOD NON SIT CERTUM DISPLICERE DEO, haud secus accipiendum est ac si praecipiat Deus." (Opusc. de Praecept. et Dispens.) ("Whatever is commanded by him who holds the place of God—unless you are sure that it displeases God—must be received as coming from God himself.") St. Bonaventure gives the same rule and almost in the same words in his Speculum Discipl., P. I., Cap. iv. The full, Catholic doctrine, which no Christian dare impeach, is laid down in full by Suarez, in the Second and Fourth Books of his Treatise De Religione, from which we have so freely quoted. But why multiply quotations to prove the point? Not one in a thousand—nor in a hundred thousand—of those who accuse the Jesuits on this score, believes in the truth of what he alleges.

In this connection we wish to notice a statement of Ranke, who is reckoned by many outside of the Church, and perhaps by some Catholics, as a fair, impartial historian of the Papacy. One example may give some idea of his title to fairness and honesty. In his well-known work (Book II.), speaking of the Jesuit vow of obedience, he says:

"Obedience in this society took the place of every other relation, of every other motive, that can sway the actions of men; absolute obedience, without a thought of its OBJECT or CONSEQUENCES."

Now, what we have to complain of here, is the ambiguity of the language. It may imply the highest praise of Jesuit obedience, and might be accepted as such by any disciple of St. Ignatius. The Jesuit, certainly, does not give a thought to the task assigned him, as to whether it be easy or arduous, whether it beimpossible to human eyes, or possible only through God's helping hand. This he leaves to the consideration of his superior. Nor does he count the consequences to himself; it is all one to him, and to the merit of obedience, whether his undertaking is to be crowned with success, or is to end in failure, chains and martyrdom.

But it may also imply that the Jesuit is indifferent as to the object of his obedience, whether it be sinful or innocent; indifferent as to its consequences, whether they be harmless, or involve the calamity, ruin and death of others. If this be Ranke's meaning, in what does he differ from the common herd of slanderers, except in the caution with which he chooses words to veil his detestable insinuations? And, that such is his meaning, appears from a note appended to the text, in which, after repeating the passage which contains the famous pharase, "*perinde ac cadaver*," he thus continues: "Here is also the other Constitution, vi. 5, according to which it seems as though a sin could be enjoined. 'Visum est nobis in Domino, nullas constitutiones, declarationes vel ordinem ullum vivendi posse obligationem ad peccatum mortale vel veniale inducere, nisi superior ea in nomine Domini Jesu Christi vel in virtute obedientiae jubeat'"—(which is thus translated by Ranke, or his English interpreter)—"'It has seemed good to us in the Lord, that no constitutions, declarations, nor any order of living, can induce an obligation to mortal or venial sin, unless the superior command them in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, or in virtue of obedience.' We can hardly trust our eyes as we read this , and indeed another interpretation of the passage is possible, besides that which obviously occurs at first sight. 'Obligatio ad peccatum mortale vel veniale' may possibly rather mean the binding force of a constitution, such that he who breaks the latter is guilty of one or the other kind of sin. It will at least be confessed that the constitution ought to be more perspicuous ; no fault can be alleged against one, who shall *bona fide* refer 'ea' to 'peccatum mortale vel veniale,' and not to 'constitutiones.'"*

We are almost tempted to re-echo the writer's words, and exclaim "we can hardly trust our eyes as we read this"—whether it be real ignorance, or only a dishonest affectation of the same. It is shameful to discuss the events of any historic period, without knowing accurately the language in which its documents were written ; and if Ranke has been ignorant of the Italian language of two or three centuries since and even of its dialectic idioms, he would have made bad work of the "Relations" or reports of Venetian ambassadors, from which he has culled such a mixture of gossip and information. He is evidently unacquainted with the phraseology of the schoolmen, according to which St. Ignatius wrote, in common with the theologians of his day. No one conversant with their style can be ignorant that such phrases as "*obligare* (or *obligatio*) *ad mortale*," or "*ad veniale*" have but one meaning, viz: to bind *under pain* of sin, whether it be mortal or venial. The general mode of expression *now* is *sub mortali* (or *gravi*), or *sub veniali*. But it was otherwise with the theologians of three, four, five and six centuries hence. A few examples will show this sufficiently. St. Thomas,† speaking of this very matter of religious vows, says: "The vow of religious profession regards principally the three things aforesaid: to wit, poverty, chastity and obedience ; and to these all things else are subordinate. And hence transgression in these three *binds* UNDER PAIN *of mortal sin.* But transgression in the rest does not *bind under pain of mortal sin*, unless it be through contempt of rule," etc. Even theological writers of a more recent date, though using more frequently the modern forms

---

* History of the Popes, their Church and State in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth centuries. Translated from the German of the last edition, by Walter K. Kelly, Esq. New York (W. H. Colyer), 1847, p. 61.

† St. Thomas 2. 2. Qu. 186., Art. ix., Resp. "Votum professionis respicit principaliter tria praedicta, scilicet paupertatem, continentiam et obedientiam ; alia vero omnia ad haec ordinantur. Et ideo transgressio horum trium *obligat ad mortale.* Aliorum autem transgressio non *obligat ad mortale.*" According to Ranke, the *obvious* meaning of this is, we suppose, obliges (to commit) mortal sin.

"*sub gravi* (*mortali*)" and *sub veniale*," yet not seldom imitate the old writers in their use of "*ad mortale, ad veniale*." Thus Suarez "Illa (voluntas superioris) non semper habet vim praecepti, sive taciti sive' expressi, nec per se *obligantis ad mortale aut ad veniale.* Ergo," etc.* Having occasion to repeat these same words or their substance a few lines below, he thus renders them: "Significatio ergo hujus voluntatis non est praeceptum expressum vel tacitum, neque inducit obligationem *sub* mortali aut veniali peccato.† And a few paragraphs afterwards: "Cum praelatus vult aliquid a subdito fieri, nolens illum *obligare* ullo modo *ad* culpam."‡ Or, simply reading the titles of the chapters of his famous book, "De Legibus," we may see how he uses promiscuously the old and the modern form. Thus, chapt. 24, "Utrum lex civilis *obliget* vel *obligare* possit *sub* reatu mortalis culpae:" chap. 25, "Utrum lex humana ut obliget *sub* mortali culpa, gravem materiam," etc.: chap. 26, "An ex verbis legis colligatur *obligatio ad mortale*, et quae verba ad hoc sufficiant." We merely add a sentence, in which he couples together both forms: "Unde, sicut supra posuimus plures conditiones requisitas ut lex civilis *obliget sub mortali*, quibus deficientibus ad summum *obligat ad veniale* ita," etc.§ But we are ashamed to linger any more on so evident a matter. Had St. Ignatius foreseen the ignorance or malice that was one day to pervert his words, he might have been "more perspicuous" in his expressions: but he could not possibly imagine that coming day of enlightenment, when scholars would be ignorant of the language universally spoken by the theologians of his time. It is sheer impudence to say, that any man may *bona fide* refer "ea" to "peccatum mortale," etc. Had it been "peccatum mortale *et* veniale," one might; but neither grammar nor good sense will sanction it in the case of "peccatum mortale *vel* veniale." We must in all propriety refer "ea" to *constitutiones* and the two following nouns, of which two are feminine and one masculine. But is is idle to talk of *good faith* in this connection. Had it been the language, we will not say of Luther or Calvin, but of Confucius or Mahomet, the impartial Ranke would have paused and investigated the matter closely, before indulging in such off-hand condemnation. But it was only a Jesuit—aye, their father and founder—and therefore he deserves no regard, but may be outlawed with impunity in the domain of historical criticism. What matters it that so many Pontiffs have examined and confirmed the Jesuit rules, or that the Council of Trent approved of their Institute as

---

* Suarez. De Religione, Lib. IV., Cap. xiv., § 11.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid., § 15.

§ De Legibus, Lib. IV., cap. xvii., § 1.

"pious?" So much the worse for them; they are the abettors of wicked men, who, at a wink from their superior, are ready to "commit mortal or venial sin," as may suit his caprice!

Assailed thus on every side, denied every chance of justice in this world, maligned by open enemies, and condemned without a hearing by those who profess to be "impartial" judges—where may the Jesuits turn for consolation? They will find it in the words of Him who tells them, calmly and authoritatively, "Nolite timere opprobrium hominum et blasphemias eorum ne metuatis; sicut enim vestimentum, sic comedet eos vermis. Salus autem mea in sempiternum erit, et justitia mea in generationes generationum." Is. li. 7, 8.

Our remarks have extended much further than we proposed; and we have no space left to speak of the fourth vow of the Jesuits, that vow which has made them the great missionaries of Christianity in modern times. And yet, to speak of the Jesuits and say nothing of their missions, is leaving out the brightest side of the picture. We had designed, too, to speak of their teaching, and of the calumnies to which it has furnished a pretext. But these points must be reserved for future articles.

James A. Corcoran.

THE BUGBEAR OF VATICANISM.

The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance: A Political Expostulation. By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M. P. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1875.

Many of the cherished bugbears, that long did excellent service against the Church, have begun to lose their power. The old charges of superstition and idolatry are being gradually abandoned to the ranting of the most fanatical, and the belief of the most ignorant. Doctrines and practices of the Church, which were thus misrepresented and caricatured, now find defenders in Protestant pulpits, and believers in Protestant homes. The real, old-fashioned Man of Sin no longer weighs as an incubus on the minds of aged Protestant spinsters, and the younger ones have begun decidedly to like the color of the Scarlet Lady. Sensible Protestants will no longer listen with patience to the tale about the abominations of the confessional, and will show their belief in the holiness of its influences by seeking wives, or persons to trust, among those who go regularly to confession. It is very remarkable, that perhaps every doctrine of the Catholic Church, save one, and every practice, save those that depend upon that one doctrine, find eloquent upholders and earnest believers and followers among those whom, little as some of them like the name, we must still persist in calling Protestants. And Protestants they certainly are, since they continue to protest, and none more vigorously, against that one doctrine, without a practical acceptance of which their claim to the title of Catholic is but a vain pretense; since Christ Himself has made it the very foundation of the Catholic Church. The very nearness of their approach, by their belief in so many of the doctrines of the Church and their use of so many of her practices, seems to require of them a louder and more vigorous protest, to discriminate themselves from those with whom their fellow-Protestants, looking from a much greater distance, are inclined to confound them. They must needs have an answer for the question which is frequently put, and with reason: "Why do you not become *real* Catholics at once?" and they must have a defense for refusing to take a step which many even of their fellow-Protestants think would be, under the circumstances, the proper one. Of this number is Mr. Gladstone; and we may find in this fact, as well as in his history and present position as a politician, some explanation of his new and fiery zeal against the Pope.

When the Public Worship Bill was before the House of Commons, Mr. Gladstone offered a set of resolutions intended to protect the Ritualists. Having failed there, he next appears as their defender in his article in the *Contemporary Review.* But the most important point with him in his appeal to the Protestant mind of England, in behalf of the Ritualists, was to remove or weaken the impression that Ritualism leads to Rome. In fact, Mr. Gladstone was at the same time defending *himself* against the charge, which had been repeatedly and publicly made, that he was a Catholic. And therefore he would show that he could abuse the Pope and his authority, as roundly as the loudest no-popery ranter of them all; as he does in the following passage: "When Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem* a policy of violence and change of faith, when she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused, when no one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another, and when she has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history, I cannot persuade myself to feel alarm as to the final issue of her crusades in England, and this although I do not undervalue her great powers of mischief."

Mr. Gladstone seems for a moment to have been a little ashamed of the facility with which he had been able to fall into the cant of the no-popery ranters, and to have been somewhat startled at the echo of his utterances, as they came back to him in the remonstrances of several of his friends, converts to the Catholic religion, who felt aggrieved and insulted by his surprising outburst. They wondered that he could have written such words, because, if for no other reason, his acquaintance with *them*, and his knowledge of their habits and grasp of mind, and of their integrity of purpose, should have taught him that men can and do become converts to the Catholic religion, "without renouncing their moral and mental freedom, and placing their civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another;" and without "repudiating" anything that may be ot value in "modern thought," or ignoring any one of the facts or teachings of "ancient history." He ought to have known that it was the long and careful and conscientious study of "ancient history," and the exercise of their own best "thought," under all the light that they could get from any quarter, that had constrained many of these men—some of them among the most gifted minds and purest characters of their land and age—at the expense of great sacrifices, to join the communion of the Catholic Church, as the kingdom of Christ on earth, and to enter into relations of loving, filial submission to the See of Peter, as the teaching and ruling authority that Christ has left in His Church.

Mr. Gladstone tells us of these expostulations, and admits the seeming roughness of some of his expressions; and he acknowledges that if he had been addressing his Catholic fellow-countrymen, he "would have striven to avoid them." But, having mounted the dangerous hobby, he could only rein it in long enough to feel and express this momentary regret. In fact, the spirit and habit of mind of the practiced debater urged him on to use his skillful fence, not only in parrying the reproaches of his friends, but in charging home his original hasty and ill-considered utterances. And so he too must expostulate in his turn; and to this it would seem that the world is indebted for the pamphlet, which he calls an "Expostulation:" "The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance." To be just to Mr. Gladstone, we should perhaps try to believe that such is the peculiarity of his mind, that he himself has come to believe in the bugbear conjured up by his imagination, and that he is by this time sincerely and thoroughly frightened at it.

The attacks of Mr. Gladstone and his friends argue, not only a strange ignorance or forgetfulness of "ancient history," and of the plain and oft-repeated utterances of Christ Himself, as recorded in the New Testament, but also a strange indifference to the lessons of *modern* history, since the outbreak of Protestantism. It is certainly remarkable that they should not see, or that they should forget, that during all these years, in the dreadful onset made by heresy and schism against the Church, the papacy has been the one bulwark of defence for all those Catholic doctrines and practices that are now so precious to Mr. Gladstone and his friends, as the very teachings and ordinances of Christ. For a large portion of this period, the ancestors and predecessors of Mr. Gladstone and his friends in the government of England, and in that pretended *branch* of the Catholic Church, were mercilessly banishing, robbing, torturing and putting to death the bishops and priests and laity in communion with the See of Peter, for teaching and holding these very doctrines. Were it not for the unshaken firmness of this central authority, those doctrines and practices must have perished from off the face of Europe, and we should not be witnessing to-day that Catholic revival in the Anglican world, with which Mr. Gladstone is, we believe, prepared to be in full sympathy, short of its leading back to Rome. And why should it not lead back to Rome? Should not these men find, in the remarkable fact which we have just been considering, strong presumptive evidence at least, to begin with, that the Catholic claim is true, and that all this is but the historical confirmation of the prophecy and promise of Christ, that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against" the Church, because of the indefectible firmness which He gave to its foundation, in the teaching and ruling authority of Peter? Mr. Gladstone and his ritualistic friends can have only one opinion as to the question, on which side were "the gates of hell," and on which side was Christ, in the Protestant revolt against the teachings and practices of the Christian Church, as they believe them to have come down from Christ and His apostles. In fact, it is notorious that they energetically repudiate the name of Protestant; and their feeling may well be illustrated by the remark of a Ritualist, who, in a conversation with the writer of this article, taking up a copy of the *Book of Common Prayer*, and calling attention to the word Protestant in the title-page, where it is stated that the book is for the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, said that he felt like taking out his pocket-knife and *digging* the word out.

Is it not strange, then, that Mr. Gladstone and his friends should feel no compunction in their furious onslaught against the venerable Mother of Christendom? Is it not unnatural, that they should so harden their hearts against the mother, not only of their faith, but of civilization? While admitting that she has brought them to Christ, and taught them all that they know of Him; while not denying that she has heroically preserved His teachings and ordinances against the attacks of "the gates of hell" for the enlightenment and blessing of ages and nations yet to be; why should they rage so violently, simply because she declares as a part of

Christian doctrine, on the authority of the clear word of Christ, that what she has done so successfully hitherto is just what she has been sent to do; and that she has His promise, that she shall be preserved in the doing of it till the end? Is it not passing strange that, in their onset against the Papacy, as they come to a nearer view of this cardinal fact of Christian history, and face to face with the august figure of an authority that so far transcends, in dignity and importance, the merits and character of the individual who may be its temporary possessor, they should feel no relenting of their purpose, no weakening of their arm, no misgiving that their blows are parricidal, and that theirs is but another of the attacks of "the gates of hell" against the Rock upon which Christ has built His Church?

We Catholics know, that—through, and above, and in spite of the miseries and weaknesses, the shortcomings and the short-sightedness, the mistaken policies, the negligence, the blunders, the sins, and even the crimes, of the human element in the Church—not only among the laity and the inferior clergy, but in the hierarchy, and in the very chair of Peter itself—Christ is still with His Church, carrying out His own plan for the teaching of the world, and making good His promise that He will ever abide with her. We know that His Spirit is the animating Spirit of the believing and teaching mind of the Church, and gives efficacy and holiness to her sacraments, and makes her the fruitful mother of saints, even in the worst and darkest of ages. But we acknowledge the shortcomings and miseries of the human side of the Church; which it were a monstrous falsehood, and the craziest of policies as well, to deny. On the contrary, we should find the most striking argument of the divine authority and efficacy of her teachings and her sacraments, and evidence of the special protection and blessing of Divine Providence upon her practical work in the world, in the fact that she so frequently accomplishes such wonders with such weak and inadequate human instruments, and in spite of, rather than in virtue of, the human character and the human wisdom and policy of her rulers and ministers and members. There may be, but too often, on their part, errors of policy and faults of conduct, which we can not but deplore, and which, while we may readily enough find reasons to account for, and sometimes extenuating circumstances to partly excuse, we can never defend.

At the same time, it were equally false and foolish to deny the great natural goodness, the amiable qualities, the noble traits, and even the high Christian character and piety of so many who are not in the Catholic fold; while regretting, for their sake, that they are deprived of the merit and graces of higher sanctity, and even heroic virtue, which such characters could not fail to acquire from the divine teachings, and the sacramental graces, and the thousand other sacred and salutary influences of the Catholic Church. But while deploring their separation from the more full communion with Christ and His Spirit, which they would enjoy in the life of that Church "which is His body," we yet have every reason to believe that many of them are far from being entirely separated from the communion of that inner soul of the Church, which is the Holy Spirit himself. Even in the noble and manly national traits of peoples who, like the English and American, are chiefly non-Catholic—in their love of liberty and justice, in their wondrous energy and capacity in their philanthropy and zeal for what they believe to be the truth—we may find reasons for firm confidence in the future of the Catholic Church, when these peoples shall have ceased to misunderstand her teachings, and shall have accepted them as of divine authority, and when they shall have no longer any quarrel with her policy; partly, perhaps, because the influence of their national character may, under the providence of God, have had no small share in shaping it. To assert this, is but to repeat substantially what the early Fathers said of God's providence in the empire of Rome, even at the very time that the empire was ignorantly doing its best to exterminate the Church, and putting to death millions of her children.

Yet, while making these concessions, we are constrained by the words of Holy Writ and of Christ Himself to hold that the Church is Christ's messenger, Christ's representative, the depository of His doctrines and His authority, and the dispenser of His blessings; that her Sacraments are the ordinary channels of His graces, and that it is through her, and in her communion, that He designs to convert, to save and to sanctify the world; in a word, that she "is His body," of which His Spirit is the very life. On the other hand, in spite of whatever concessions we may make as to the goodness and honesty and Christian piety of many of those who are not of her communion, and even of some who actively and bitterly oppose her; yet we hold, and with good reason, that the opposition to her is inspired and planned and directed by the Spirit of evil, who, is the enemy of God and man, and therefore the bitterest enemy of the Church, just because she *is* the Church of God, and, with all her *human* miseries, is ever the best friend of man.

Christ himself plainly points out to us that the conflict of the Son of Man, throughout the whole period of the existence of His Kingdom on earth, is to be, not merely with the natural passions of the human heart,—the ordinary darkness and perversity of the human mind;—but, with all these roused and intensified and powerfully aided and directed to his purposes by a potent and subtle spirit of evil, whom He calls "the Prince of this World."

Christ predicts for His Church the conflict and its character, and assures her of the victory, in the promise that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against her." The mighty power that is designated by "the gates of hell," is the kingdom of "the prince of this world," who wages eternal warfare against the kingdom of Truth, and Christ its King. The "World" of which this spirit is the "prince," is the world with which Christ would have nothing to do, the world for which He refused to pray, and which, He said, was already condemned. We learn from this, that there are two worlds,—the world which God made, and which He "so loved," "that He gave for it His only begotten Son,"—and another world, which God never made,—a world of sin and error and darkness and disorder, which is entirely evil, and is the work of a malignant spirit, who is the enemy of the truth, the "father of lies" and "a liar from the beginning."

With such a "world," that is the principality of Satan, it is a matter of course, that Christ can have nothing to do but to wage war for its destruction. It is precisely to emancipate men from its horrid thraldom, that the Father has given His only begotton Son, and thus shown how much he loved the world. The immense value of such liberation is to be gathered not only from the dignity and power of Him who was sent to offer it deliverance, but from the awful price that He paid for a boon, which cannot be entirely disproportionate to what it has cost.

The world, that God so much loves, is in the minds and hearts of men, whom He has made in His own image, and who are thus His children by nature as well as by supernatural adoption. He has made them from the beginning for Himself: while He had made all other things for them. The image of Himself, which He impressed upon their nature in giving them intelligence and will, necessarily determined the object for which alone they could be created, namely, the knowledge of the Truth and the love of the Good, which is God. It was in the creation of this child of God, that all the other objects of the visible creation found the solution of their mystery. For the cycles of ages, if you choose, during which all else was forming, the world was without an eye to see, without a heart to feel, without a voice to tell, the glory of God. There was no *mind* in the world, that could read the handwriting of the Creator spread out over all His works, to tell of his invisible glory and divinity; there was no *heart* in the world, to bring it back, with the impulse of love, to the God from whom it had had its being. It was only when, amid the countless multitude and variety of objects, inanimate and animate, at length appeared in the world man, endowed with *reason*—with the capacity to know and to love—that God bowed the heavens to the embrace of earth, and earth was raised to the kiss of Heaven; and then were celebrated the espousals of Heaven and earth in the mind and heart of man. Then for the first time did all the sounds of nature become voices speaking to the ear of intelligence of the goodness of God;—and the word of man became the voice of the world giving praise to its great Creator. Man is, therefore, not inappropriately called "the Lord of Creation." But it is the *Truth* that makes him master, and makes all things else his servants.

The fallen rebel angel, who had become a spirit of evil and the enemy of God, could not but hate this reign of Truth, and could not but be filled with jealous rage against the favored child who was one day to be taken *home* from this *school* to fill the place of the fallen one in the Father's house in heaven. He therefore exerts all his strength and subtlety to mar this beautiful harmony, to thwart God's plan, to drag down the "lord of creation," to make him rebel against the Truth, and thus become the slave of sense and of the elements of the world, and the thrall of him who would thus begin to be "the prince of this world." He induces man to shut his eyes wilfully to the Truth, and to refuse to obey its behests; to violate the law and to disregard the voice of the monitor, which the Truth had placed in his bosom. It is by lying that the spirit of evil accomplishes all this, and thus becomes a "liar from the beginning;" and it is only by continued lying—by denial or false presentation of the truth—by calling truth error, and error truth—by proclaiming good to be evil, and evil good—that the "father of lies" can continue in possession of the power which he has thus usurped.

Christ, having come to emancipate us from thraldom, and to restore us to even a higher position than that from which we had fallen, must necessarily have come to be the Teacher of the Truth. He must teach man the origin and character of his spiritual nature; he must remind him of his destiny and furnish him with the means of attaining it. In opposition to the reign of the "father of lies," he must set up the kingdom of Truth. It is His own word, in explanation of the real character of His kingdom, at the moment that he had acknowledged to the Roman governor that He was truly a king: "For this was I born, and for this came I into the world; that I might give testimony of the Truth;" and again He tells us: "You shall know the Truth; and the Truth shall set you free."

The "prince of this world" must needs hate with a perfect hatred this kingdom of Truth. He must needs exert all the mighty powers of his angelic intelligence, and all the tremendous forces of his perverted angelic will, to exterminate the King of Truth, and to prevail over His Kingdom. Christ Himself, during His passion, points out the influence of this Satanic power in compassing His death: "*Now* is your hour, and the *power of darkness;*" and in predicting the perpetual failure, he indicates the perpetual renewal, of the efforts of "the gates of hell" to prevail against His Church. All arguments will be good enough; no error too gross; no calumny too atrocious for "the father of lies," if they but serve his purpose in keeping the minds and hearts of men from rendering Christ's kingdom the allegiance which He asks of them. This spirit will have no compunction in persuading men that Christ's appointed shepherd is the very anti-Christ, and that the priests of the Church have the signs of the *beast* in the shape of hoofs and horns, as there were people to believe in benighted regions of our own country a generation or two ago. He will persuade people, who profess to be Christians, that filial veneration for the mother of their Lord is heathenish superstition, and that the devout offering of Christ's eucharistic sacrifice is idolatry. He assured Pagans in Rome, that Christians who assembled in secret to receive the Holy Communion, met to eat the flesh of a new-born babe; and he assures Pagans in China, that pure and heroic women consecrated to God, who devote their lives to caring for abandoned children, only gather them in to torture and to maim them for purposes of magic. And when these falsehoods are at length dispelled by a flood of light, convincing men who want to be Christians that the doctrines and practices of the Church come down from Christ and His Apostles, the adversary of Christ will inspire them with new fear and hate of that authority which is the safeguard and custodian of them all and without which they would not have come down to us at all.

It is but natural that the powers of darkness, in their attacks on the edifice that Christ has built, should ever seek to destroy that authority which the Builder Himself has made to be the very foundation. But particularly must so subtle an adversary feel the tactical need of prejudicing against this authority the minds of men who have been hitherto in possession of Catholic truth, or seem to be fast approaching to it. As he cannot hope to feed *them* upon the horrors that may pass well enough among others, he must exasperate them against the Pope, knowing well as he does, that this bond of unity and strength being taken away, the belief in the various doctrines must perish, or remain ever unfruitful, lacking the vital efficacy and completeness which they can have only in the living "body of Christ," and in loving submission to and communion with its Head. We find illustrations of these tactics in the action of Henry VIII. and in the writings of Mr. Gladstone,—the one intended to tear England away from the Pope, and the other to render it more difficult for her to return to him. The king had published a book against Luther in defence of the Seven

Sacraments, and received for it from the Pope the title of "defender of the faith;" and proudly wearing the title, and still believing in the doctrines of the book, he shortly after cuts off the head of Bishop Fisher, who is believed to have written the book for him, simply because the saintly bishop could not bring himself to admit that it was to civil rulers, and not to Peter, that Christ had given the keys of His kingdom. And Mr. Gladstone, having set out to defend the liberty of the ritualists to believe and practice pretty much every other doctrine of the Catholic system, ends by lashing himself into a passion, to frighten them from using their liberty to the extent of going to Rome.

There are two classes of persons, of whom we may say with the melancholy Dane, that the prince of this world "is potent with such spirits," and each of whom would certainly do well to take heed in time, and to say to himself, with the same melancholy prince: "The spirit that I have seen, may be a devil," which "abuses me, to damn me." One of these classes may well be represented by unspiritual, material, blood-and-iron men of the world, of the Bismarck type, for whom the "prince of this world" must have a special fondness; and the other by dreamers and talkers like Dr. Döllinger and Mr. Gladstone, whose imaginations have the magic power to conjure up the bugbear in the most gigantic proportions and with all of the most appropriate drapery and surroundings, and whose skillful rhetoric supplies all the special pleading that may be necessary to give impulse or justification for the policy of the former.

But too often does the "prince of the world" find his allies not merely in the passions and ignorance of private individuals—in the jealousies and hates of Pharisees and high-priests, and in the folly of the rabble; but in the jealousy and ambition and groundless fears of the holders of civil power or aspirants to its possession—of men who sit on the throne of Cæsar, or stand near to it as his counselors and ministers; or of vulgar and cowardly politicians, who seek his favors or fear his frowns. It was only by the power of Cæsar, on the false charge of disloyalty to Cæsar, and through the cowardly fear of Cæsar's displeasure on the part of a politician, that high-priests and Pharisees were able to compass the death of Christ. "We have found this man perverting our nation," said His accusers, "and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar;" although He had said, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," and had ordered Peter to pay tribute for Him and for himself. And, again, to the governor, who had declared Him to be innocent, they cried out; "If thou lettest this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend." And so has it been—and naturally enough—in every subsequent age.

As "the prince of the world" finds his best aids for destroying the reign of truth and virtue over the individual heart in the animal passions and in the love of temporal things, what wonder that he should find his best ally against Christ's universal kingdom of Truth, in the jealousy and lust for power and pride of place, and even in the avarice of the holders of the temporal power? What wonder that for such inducements he should often be permitted to pervert its strong arm from its legitimate uses, and to wield "the arm of the flesh" to worry, and restrain, and smite, and "crucify" the Church of Christ? As the "father of lies" tempts man to rebel against God, in order to make him a slave to himself, so does Cæsar, under his prompting, abuse the national pride and the patriotic impulses of the people, rousing exaggerated or groundless fears of the Pope, in order to divert their attention from the loss of their liberties, when he would perpetuate despotic power already usurped, or frighten them into surrendering their liberties to his keeping, as their protector, when he would inaugurate a despotism. Sooth to say, the people that suffer themselves to be fooled out of their liberties, or to continue to be robbed and oppressed by bad government through such false issues, deserve no better fate.

The Gladstones of Christ's time feared too numerous *conversions*: "If we let Him alone, all will believe in Him"—and they feared or pretended to fear the political consequences: "and the Romans will come, and take our place and nation;" and so they rejected the king of Truth and proclaimed their "*undivided allegiance*," saying: "We have no king but Cæsar." And the men of Bismarckian spirit, believing or feigning to believe that the *expostulation* was made seriously, found in it their incentive or their excuse for an energetic policy, which was proclaimed as follows: "Let him be crucified."

All these various types have had their specimens in every age, and find their representatives in our own in Döllinger, and Schulte, and Gladstone, and Bismarck, and the *nameless* petty despots and spurious republicans of some of the Swiss Cantons, and even in the "Republican Congressional Committee" of Washington. But to be just to our "Republican Committee," we must admit that they did not really mean much mischief by their late absurd pamphlet about Bismarck and the Pope. The rather abruptly deduced moral of the whole thing, which was: "Don't vote the Democratic ticket, but vote ours," sufficiently indicates, what we believe to be the fact, that they were but very little concerned about either Bismarck or the Pope, except so far as they thought this appeal to the ignorance and latent bigotry of a certain class a good enough expedient to whip up a sufficient number of Republican voters to keep or to put themselves and their friends in office. We may feel quite sure that, if Catholics should ever be in a considerable majority in this country, the "Republican Congressional Committee" of that day will be found passing indignant resolutions against the Bismarck of the day for his despotic violation of "liberty of conscience," and sending addresses of sympathy to the persecuted Catholics for their heroic defense of that sacred principle.

If Cæsar would but occupy his own place, there would never be any quarrel between Christ and him. Then would the King of Truth and His representatives till the end of time be ever but too happy to bless his power, and to say to men that they should respect his laws, and give willing and cheerful obedience to whatever the State enacts. The King of the Kingdom of Truth has come to teach men, not so much their rights, as their duties to God, to their fellow-men, and to themselves. And there He stands within the realm which He has chosen for Himself—the realm of religious and moral truth; and if Cæsar—in no matter what shape or form—shall ever dare to violate this sanctuary—shall require men to say of what Christ teaches, that it is not true; to hold as lawful and just, what Christ has taught to be unlawful and unjust; to do what Christ forbids, or to omit what He commands, then must they do as the Master before them did, refuse to obey Cæsar, and, in the words of him to whom Christ first gave the keys of the kingdom, must they repeat, "*Non possumus.*"

And so Cæsar kills the King of Truth, as he has killed so many of the holders of the keys of the kingdom. But it is by dying that this King conquers, as He prophesies: "When I shall be lifted up from the earth, then shall I begin to draw all things to myself," and that He fulfils that other prophecy, so pertinent to our subject: "*Now* shall *the prince of this world* be cast out."

The Pagan Cæsars could not be friends with Christ; for they had usurped supreme powers in the spiritual, as well as in the temporal order, and even the attributes of divinity. Cæsar was *Pontifex Maximus*, as well as *Divus Imperator;* he heard with jealousy and alarm of another *Pontifex Maximus*, who had come, with strange audacity, in the shape of a Galilean fisherman, to place his chair in Rome, hard by the throne of Cæsar. He could not brook the thought of a kingdom in the world, even though a purely spiritual one, over which he should have no control; of a sacred realm of religious and moral truth, and of duties flowing therefrom, which he should be forbidden to invade. And so Cæsar resorts to his usual *argument*—he imprisons and kills the Galilean fisherman; and for three centuries he continues to kill his successors. They and their followers are compelled to burrow in the earth to find graves for their sacred dead; and to find an altar for their worship by placing a slab upon the tomb of a martyr. But it was this church of the catacombs that, praying, worshiping, dying, undermined to its destruction the monstrous fabric of heathen Cæsarism; until at the end of the three centuries it became good *policy*, apart from the miraculous nature of his conversion, for Cæsar to declare himself a subject of Christ the King, and a son of His Church.

But, strange to say, Cæsar did not forget his old ways, and he would still show the itching to clutch those keys of which the King had said, not to him, but to the fisherman by the sea of Galilee: "I will give to *thee* the keys of the kingdom." The great St. Athanasius of Alexandria spent the better part of his life in exile, under the persecution of the first Christian Cæsar, Constantine, and his sons, because of their constant meddling with the teaching and discipline of the Church. And so was it with but too many of the successors of Constantine. But what has been the fate for ages of the throne that he left in the city by the Bosphorus, to which he gave his name? And what of imperial Rome? The blood-stained cross of the King of Truth has been able to beat down the sword of mighty Cæsar. That cross remains: and Cæsar is—where? The city of Rome to-day is not the city of the Cæsars. The boasted *eternal* city of the Cæsars lies buried twenty feet under the rubbish of its mighty ruins, and the *eternal* city of to-day is the city of Christ—it is the city of the Galilean fisherman.

As it happened to the Empire, so too did it fare with the individual Cæsars and their representatives, in opposing the kingdom of Christ. He has said: "All power is given to me." Let them, then, beware. If they oppose Him, they shall be destroyed. Herod died in exile; Pilate and Nero each lost his place, and died by his own hand, the death of Judas. And of the successors of Nero one after another was hurled from his place and murdered. So that it is a significant fact, that while in the first three centuries Cæsar did to death thirty-three Popes—it took fifty Cæsars to do it.

The history of the mediæval empire, which the Popes had blessed and almost created, is a repetition of the same history. Cæsar would rule the Church. He would appoint its officers; he would bestow its mitres and croziers, and very frequently *sell* them. The representative of Christ the King must needs forbid, and, when asked to approve or be silent, must say, "*Non possumus.*" And hence the old struggle; in which, of course, as of old, Cæsar went to the wall.

Christ asks but little for His kingdom here below. He asks to be let alone. But Cæsar will not let Him alone. It is the old word of the high-priests and Pharisees: "*If we let Him alone, all will believe in Him.*" And Cæsar is jealous of the wondrous allegiance of mind and heart that is paid to the kingdom of Christ by those who "believe in Him." When Cæsar has once witnessed this, he is no longer satisfied with the allegiance and the service that they give to him. It is not always from love that they give it, for Cæsar is sometimes very unlovable; but always from a sense of duty, and for His sake who has said: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." But Cæsar is angry, that man should serve him or endure him for *Christ's* sake. He wishes to be served for his own sake—*Divus Imperator!* He is not satisfied that men should spill their blood and give up their lives to build up or prop up his throne, in making war against his enemies. He is angry if, as they go out to die, they should salute any other, even a spiritual chief, before him. "*Cæsar morituri te salutant.*"

It has been decreed in the Councils of the new German Cæsar, that the Kingdom of Truth must either become a mere sacristy or vestry of the imperial palace, or shall have no existence at all. But Christ has a sense of His own dignity, and He cannot consent to become the mere chaplain of His Imperial Majesty. And that is the cause of all the trouble. It is said that these German bishops are resisting the law. Of course they are. For it is a law that binds them hands and feet—a law that requires that there shall be no man to dare to call his soul his own, within the broad realms of His Imperial Majesty. A Minister of Public Worship must have much to say in the appointment of bishops and parish priests in the erection and government of diocesan seminaries, and in determining the amount and quality of training that shall be given to aspirants to the priesthood. Imperial Cæsar becomes a teacher of theology, a doctor of divinity! Now it certainly does not suit Cæsar's style of beauty to play any such part; and it sounds very ill in the mouth of Englishmen, and still more of Americans, to applaud the performance. Their action is just as rational and decent as, and less consistent than, that of the flatterers who applauded the fiddling of his illustrious predecessor, Nero the First, during the burning of Rome, which he had set on fire;—of another of whose titles to distinction it is to be hoped that the admirers of the modern Cæsar are duly appreciative, namely, that he showed his keen sense of his right to *an undivided allegiance* by awarding to the first Pope on the Janiculum the same death that, in the name of Cæsar, had been awarded to His Master on Calvary, the death of the cross.

It is strangely inconsistent for people who boast loudly of their love of liberty, to applaud the modern German despotism, which with cynical coolness crushes out all those liberties, of conscience, of speech, and of the press, over which these people can grow so eloquent. It is stranger still, and ominous for the future of liberty, that they should be so ignorant or so forgetful of the fact that it is only in the sanctuary of conscience, enlightened by true religion, that liberty has its birth, and ever finds its home and its fortress. They forget that it is only the teachings of the Popes, and the heroic struggles and martyrdom of them and of their colleagues for centuries, in their conflicts with Cæsarism and barbarism, that have rendered possible the pacific assertion and possession of the rights of the weak against the strong, of the individual against the community, of the conscience against Cæsar, of the soul against the State-god. They ungratefully turn their backs upon the mother of their liberties and of their civilization, and appear to forget all about her claims. They appear to think that all this has come to them, as a matter of course, in imitation of the sage in Shakespeare, who tells us that "reading and writing come by nature;" and they talk flippantly about these things as self-evident, and as if they had never caused a struggle.

That all men are born free and equal, is proclaimed as a self-evident proposition in our glorious Declaration of Independence, in spite of the notorious fact that might, with much greater truth, be called evident—if not self-evident—that some are born to wealth, and comfort, and strength, and talent, and consequent power, while others are born to imbecility, and idiocy, and poverty, and slavery. The only sense, in which this boasted proposition can be true, is one based upon natural religion, and confirmed by the teachings of revealed truth. If there is no God, or again if we can have no knowledge of a God, then it is but a mockery to talk of either rights or duties, and worse than a mockery to talk of the *self-evident* equality of men. It would then be strictly true that might would be right, and the only meaning that would remain to the word duty, would be submission to a power that we dare not disobey but at our peril. The very idea of right is correlative with that of duty: and this duty by the nature of the case cannot be towards those who are pronounced by the very fact of their birth to be our equals; but it must be to a superior power having a right to our allegiance; a power that is absolute justice, a power that has perfect knowledge, a power that can read the mind and the heart and account for their secret motives, a power that is omnipresent, a power that has absolute sovereignty and lordship, and even ownership over those who owe it allegiance; and this power, whether to the first man in the garden of delights, to the Hebrew in the courts of the temple, to the Pagan in the Roman Pantheon, or to the besotted savage squatting in an African jungle and hugging his fetish to his heart—is God. It is written upon the heart of every man by the finger of the Creator, that God is his Maker, and that by the intelligence that enables him to know the truth, and the will that empowers him to embrace the good, he partakes in some degree of the image of God, and that all those who share this intelligence and free will are his *equals*, because his brethren and children of one common Father. It is a remarkable coincidence, and far from being a casual one, that the age which was destined to revive the horrid slavery of Pagan Cæsarism is the same that, with strange ostentation, parades as a discovery of science that there is no God; or, with cool cynicism, relegates Him to the region of the unknowable, with which, from the fact that we can know nothing about it, is naturally enough drawn the deduction that we can have no concern.

From such as these it is simply an impertinence that the charge should come, we shall not say against Catholics or Christians, but against any man who has natural religion, that his ideas of his duty to God may clash with his duties to any man or body of men organized into the community of the State. Such men put themselves out of court at the very outset; for by their doctrines they destroy the first idea of rights and duties; and if they are logical, they must admit that they will only obey or respect any so-called authority as long as it suits their pleasure, caprice or interests to do so; or as the fear of unpleasant consequences deters them from doing the opposite.

An all-sufficient answer to such as these should be: If at any time what we choose to call our conscience should prompt us to disobey and to defy the mandates of a State, while generally requiring us to obey them, we certainly can be no worse in the face of the State than you, who begin by telling us that under no circumstances can you admit that you have a conscience at all, to require you to obey any of its mandates. What we would call our conscience, even though you would call it an irrational superstition or caprice, is certainly as respectable as the caprice that would permit you to disregard all so-called authority, except so far as the manifestation of your disregard might entail disagreeable consequences.

No less impertinent would be a similar objection that might be raised by a man who held none but mere natural religion, namely, a belief in God, and the moral law that is written on the heart of man by God and enforced by His sanction. Such a man might object, that any one believing in a revealed religion, whether Christian, Mahometan or Buddhist, cannot be a truly loyal citizen; for the reason that such religion commands certain things that it may at some time suit the caprice of a government to forbid, or forbids something that such government may choose to command. Such objector would seem for the moment to forget that he, too, holds in his *natural* religion, that there are many things that the law of God prescribes, and that therefore no State can lawfully forbid; and many things forbidden, that no State can lawfully require. In his zeal to invade the sanctuary of conscience of him who believes in a revealed religion, he is but surrendering the sanctuary of his own conscience. Again, any man who believes, or thinks he believes, in what he calls the Christian religion, as he chooses to construct it for himself (without the slightest warrant of its Founder) from the fragmentary records of the New Testament, and without the slightest regard to the living authority of Christendom, to which these fragmentary records, and all Christian history, and the voice of the great majority of Christians in every age, so clearly point, does believe, and must believe, that there are many things forbidden him by a divine authority which, if the State should command him to do, he must disobey it and defy it, and hold that, to that extent, its authority is but a usurpation and a tyranny, to be resisted by him even at the peril of his life. From such a one the charge comes with but poor grace against those who believe in the living authority of historic Christianity, that in certain contingencies their Christian religion might require them to disregard or to defy the mandates of a state. The logical deduction from what is thus implied is that loyalty to a state is the sum of all virtues; that the State can do no wrong; that no man can have any rights as against the State; that the State is supreme in all things; that the State is God, and the ruler of the State the *Divus Imperator* (the divine emperor).

This were simply the horrid monster of Pagan Cæsarism ruling over the abject and slavish mass of those of whom it is written, that "their god is their belly, and their end is perdition." And this is the great gain that has been achieved as the result of the longing of generations of patriotic Germans, and purchased by their treasure and their blood. They were lately told by his excellency the Prince Chancellor of this new Cæsar, that the subjective conscience has no rights in the face of the objective law. And so this new Cæsar would be, as his prototypes of old, not merely a ruler for certain well-defined temporal purposes, but he must also be the *Pontifex Maximus*, and in fact, if not in name, the *Divus Imperator*.

With especially poor grace comes such a charge from Englishmen, who boast of their liberties, and of their glorious revolution; and still more from Americans, who have been taught to revere the Declaration of Independence as a sort of sacred testament;—from Englishmen and Americans, who have been so prone to hail in every revolutionist a new Franklin or a new Washington, and have been taught by their fathers to look with jealousy upon the exercise of the civil power, and to regard resistance to its encroachments as the noblest of civic virtues.

Taught as we have been in such a school, as well as in the school of Catholic Theology which tells us of the absolute sanctity of the sanctuary of conscience, such implied charge of disloyalty should have for us no terrors. Of course we should be disloyal, not to our country, or to the general principle of civil authority, but to what would be a usurpation and a tyranny. Of course the very men who shed their blood to build up the throne of the German Cæsar, and who would be prepared again at any moment to go out to do battle for their country, are, and must be, disloyal to his iniquitous interference with the rights of Christ. They must refuse, at the peril of their souls, to repeat the cry of the Jewish mob that condemned Christ to death: "We have no king but Cæsar." For, first of all, they must acknowledge and maintain the rights of the Kingdom of Christ. But it is an abuse of terms to speak of such disobedience as disloyalty; when obedience would be treason to Christ and disobedience to God, from whom alone is all power, as the Apostle teaches.

It was not of the spirit of the fathers of American liberty, as well as of American laws and order—but of a later day, of cheaper but more blatant patriotism—to utter the blasphemous phrase that passed for heroic: "My country, right or wrong." And, again, it is not of the spirit of the fathers of English liberty, who demanded the rights of the people from a tyrant king "in the name of God"—but of the modern age, which relegates God to the region of the unknowable—to call, in euphonistic phrase, the "blood and iron" policy of Prince Bismarck a firm determination that the laws of the State shall not be disregarded, nor the rights of the State encroached upon by the spiritual power.

But it is particularly saddening to find a Christian statesman like Mr. Gladstone, who is far from relegating God beyond the limits of His creation, making use of this cry, which in its last analysis is Pagan, or worse than Pagan—simply atheistic. Mr. Gladstone, in his profession of Christianity, must be able to imagine scores of cases, in which his conscience as a Christian might have to come in conflict with the mandates of a Paganized and despotic State. Let us hope that he would have the consistency to go to the stake for conscience sake; while we may also sincerely hope that the day may be far distant when his country shall be deprived of the service of his eminent abilities by his premature martyrdom. But we may with equal assurance hope that the day is equally distant when any English Catholic shall have to go to the stake, in the bitter alternative of obeying a law of the State, only at the expense of sacrificing his conscience. In any case, the English Catholic can surely assert his equal right with that of Mr. Gladstone to follow the dictates of his conscience; and it surely puts such

Catholic at no disadvantage, that besides such natural abilities as he may be able to command, he has the immense benefit of the light reflected upon conscience by the Christian religion, as Christ Himself has chosen to establish it, in a living, perpetual body, with a well-defined constitution, and a living and speaking authority, teaching all things whatsoever He has commanded.

Catholics in England, and, if similar questions should arise here, Catholics in this country, might with perfect propriety refuse to discuss with Mr. Gladstone or any similar objectors the meaning, or the force, or the possible or probable bearings upon their allegiance, of the "Vatican Decrees," or of any of the teachings of their religion. They might well resent such challenge as an impertinence, and assert that they are no more called upon to prove their loyalty than is Mr. Gladstone himself, or any one else who believes in a God. Mr. Gladstone and those who may share the fears which he entertains, or makes believe to entertain, of the disloyalty of Catholics—because in some possible, but quite problematic contingency, their consciences may require them to disobey a mandate of the State—would do much better to devote their attention to that new and rapidly increasing school of those who will not have the slightest difficulty in acknowledging that they are Englishmen first, and neither Catholics nor Christians afterwards; and who, while they can contemplate no possible contingency in which their conscience may require them to disregard a law of the State, will be equally frank in admitting that they can imagine no possible contingency in which their conscience will require them to obey one; for the very satisfactory reason that in their system conscience can logically have no place at all.

Yet we may consider it fortunate that Mr. Gladstone has given occasion, by his too famous pamphlet, to so full a discussion of the teaching and ruling authority of the Christian Church. This discussion will awaken many earnest minds to a keener sense of the tremendous importance of the question: What is the Christian religion? What has Christ made it? What did He intend it to be? No question can be of more importance to the civilized world, which, not by chance, is co-extensive with Christendom. Upon the proper understanding of the answer to this question must depend the best hopes of all the world in time, and the overwhelming interests of the immortal souls of men in eternity.

It is plain from the doings and sayings of Christ, and from all Christian history, that Christ never intended that His Christian religion should have to be gathered in future ages from some fragmentary records that, not by His command, but as if by chance, should happen to be written; and much less that the pretended sense of these writings should be dispensed in larger or smaller doses, as a nostrum, by every quack who should set up to be an interpreter; but on the contrary, that He came to establish a Kingdom of Heaven on earth, to form a Christian family, to build a Christian house, ("I will build my Church," etc.,) to gather a Christian flock; and that all these, by Christ's promise and by His abiding power, are to continue till the end. To this Kingdom, to this family, to this Church, to this flock, he has given a well-defined constitution, and clearly defined powers; and He has left it deficient in no respect in any of those qualities that go to make up a well governed kingdom, a well regulated family, an orderly household, a safely guarded flock. Among Christian men there can be no dispute that Christ is the King of the Kingdom, the Father of the family, the Head of the Church, the Shepherd of the Christian flock. And were it not for the strange facility with which men run after the wildest fancies, and shut their eyes to the clearest light, in the things that belong to God, it should be equally beyond dispute that Christ having left His Kingdom, His family, His Church, His flock to remain in the world until the end of the world, whence He Himself has withdrawn His natural, visible presence, has left in His place a Ruler of His Kingdom, a Father of His family, a Head of His Church, a Shepherd of His sheep.

All this is stated, even in those fragmentary Scriptures from which these Christian men chiefly gather what knowledge they have of Christianity. It is stated in these Scriptures much more plainly than are the Divinity of Christ, the doctrine of the Trinity, and many other doctrines which these men hold to be essential parts of the Christian religion.

It is plain from these records, as it is from the history of the Christian world from that day to this, that Christ established in his Church the office of a supreme teacher and ruler, who is His vicegerent; whose authority is to last as long as the Church of whose constitution this authority is a most conspicuous and essential part. To this office He gave the power and the command to feed His flock with true doctrine, to define what He had taught, to appoint, to confirm, to teach and to reprove the inferior and subordinate rulers of His Kingdom and shepherds of his flock. This office, to which He gave the supreme teaching authority in His Church, by the very nature of truth and the character of the adhesion we must give to it, is necessarily infallible. Of this teaching authority, it is the voice of Christian antiquity expressed in proverbial form: "Peter has spoken; the case is ended."

It has ever belonged to this office to convene a General Council; and no definition of a Council has ever been considered a definition at all, unless and so far as that definition was approved and confirmed by the holder of this office.

To the holder of this office did Christ also give supreme judicial power in His Church; and therefore were the most powerful bishops of the most ancient Oriental sees ever ready to invoke his authority to right their wrongs and to reinstate them in their sees, even against the authority of numerously attended councils of their fellow-Oriental bishops; while on the other hand, it was a maxim of Christian antiquity, that "the first see could be judged by no one."

To the holder of this office did Christ also give supreme legislative and executive power in His Church, so that the disciplinary enactments, like the definitions of the faith of General Councils, have their binding force only from his approval and his confirmation. And by his authority not merely are individual bishops appointed and judged, but new Episcopal sees are established, and old ones suppressed.

It is a power of wondrous extent, such as the world had not seen before, till a man stood in the world who alone of all men durst say: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life;" and has so made good His claim as to have now the allegiance of the best and choicest portion of humanity for ages, so that civilization to-day is simply co-extensive with belief in Him. This Man-God, if He is what He claims to be, the Saviour, the Teacher, the Sanctifier of the world, and not merely of the land and the people in which and among whom He lived and died, must be equally for us the Way, the Truth, and the Life; and He must continue to teach and to bless with the same authority, with the same clearness and precision, and with the same divine efficacy, with which He taught and blessed of old. When we thus consider what He claims to be His mission, and yet find that He has withdrawn from the world His natural visible presence, when He had scarcely fairly begun His work, we would have but too much reason to feel that it was not the benignity and the humanity of our Saviour God, but rather the freak of some mocking spirit, that could have held out such glorious hopes only to bitterly disappoint them, if He had not left in the world some living authority, with the same universal mission, as to time and place, that He had claimed for Himself.

Again, from the very nature of the work, which He says He has come to do—to teach men the truth which is one; to make them one family of God's children; to establish one fold, one Church, one kingdom in the world—we have every right to expect of His wisdom and power that He would provide for the doing of this work, such unity and inerrancy in teaching, such unity and efficiency of discipline, as necessarily require a supreme and central authority both in teaching and in ruling. So that if we could for a moment obliterate from our minds all else that we know of Christ's positive enactments and of the history of His Church, we might with good reason assert that He must have left with His Church just such an authority; as in fact even the imperfect records of Christian Scriptures, and the whole of Christian Church-history, point out as one of the most conspicuous and cardinal facts of the Christian system and the Christian teaching.

Christ, then, has pledged His word, that in His Church to the end of time shall abide, even in weak and imperfect man, an office, by virtue of which *He* will continue to teach, to rule, to guide and to feed His flock. Christ, the Rock, says to a man named Simon: "Thou art a rock; and on this rock I will build my Church." Christ, the King, says to this same man: "I will give to *thee* the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." The unshakable stability of that Church which He builds, so that He swears that all the powers of hell shall never prevail against it, is made to depend on the unshaken firmness of this Central Office upon which it is built. To this same man, Christ, the Shepherd of the whole flock, says with triple emphasis: "Feed my lambs; feed my sheep." To this same man, Christ, the Head and Father of the whole Christian family, says: "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift *you*" [in the plural] as wheat; but I have prayed for *thee*" [in the singular] "that thy faith fail not; and do thou in turn one day confirm thy brethren."

Even though none of these words had been written for our instruction, they certainly would not have been uttered in vain; they certainly would have obtained their full force and have accomplished all that Christ intended. Even though the Scriptures of the New Testament had never been written, we should have had precisely the same living, speaking and ruling authority in the Church, that we have. In fact, more than one generation had lived and died under the Christian dispensation, before certain of those words, which were uttered by Christ, had been written by the last of the Evangelists.

Once we are assured that Christ has established a Church, it is sufficient for us to find where is that Church to-day; and then we can safely, without further inquiry, believe all that she teaches is of divine faith, and obey her authority as the authority of Christ. We may, with excellent reason, reject as impertinent the appeal from the Church of to-day to the Church of the earliest centuries. The great bulk of Christ's family should certainly not be required to become learned in ancient history, in archaeology, in paleontology, in hermeneutics, before they can even feel that they are Christians.

Yet, as a matter of abundance in argument and an additional comfort to our faith, we can appeal to the Christian Fathers of the earliest as well as of all subsequent centuries; and we find them all pointing to the See of Peter in Rome, as exercising in every age the very office that Christ, in the person of Peter, left with His Church.

We must refer those of our readers, who are not familiar with the passages, to the works of the Fathers themselves, or to the collections of their testimonies to be found in the theological writers.* We must content ourselves with quoting one of the earliest, St. Ireneus, of the second century, whose language must startle our Protestant friends by the perfectly well developed "popery," and the rebuke of private judgment, which it contains. He speaks of the Church of Rome as the "greatest and most ancient * * constituted by Peter and Paul." He then goes on to say: "The faith announced to all men, through the succession of her bishops, has come down to us; and by pointing out such faith and such tradition, we confound all those who in any way, whether through pleasing themselves, or vain-glory, or blindness and perverse opinion, assemble otherwise than as behooveth them." "For to this Church," he continues, "on account of *a more powerful principality*, it is necessary that every church, that is, those who are on every side faithful, should resort; in which Church has been preserved that tradition which is from the Apostles."

We may sum up the tradition and teaching of all previous centuries with the united testimony of Greeks and Latins in the General Council of Florence, as follows: "We define that the Apostolic See, that is, the Roman Pontiff, has the right of primacy over all the churches of the world; that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter; that he is the very Vicar of Christ, the Head of the whole Church, the Father and Teacher of all the Faithful; that, in the person of Peter, he was intrusted by our Lord with full power to feed, direct and govern the whole flock of Christ. Such is manifestly the doctrine taught by the acts of the General Councils, as well as by the sacred canons."

And the Council of the Vatican but defines more explicitly what is implied by all this, and especially by the statement that the Pope is the *teacher* of all the faithful, and has full power to feed, direct and govern the whole flock of Christ, when it says: "We teach and define it to be a doctrine divinely revealed, that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedrâ*, that is, when in the exercise of his office as Pastor and Teacher of all Christians, and in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines that a doctrine regarding faith or morals is to be held by the universal Church; he possesses, through the divine assistance promised to him in the blessed Peter, that infallibility, with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed, in defining a doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not by force of the consent of the Church; and again, when it says that to him "both pastors and faithful are bound by the duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, not only in things which appertain to faith and morals, but likewise in those things which concern the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the world." We have seen what is the office of Peter and its extent. Are there no limitations? Of course there are, most numerous and well defined; taught by Christ Himself, by right reason, by Catholic theology, and by the very same authority which teaches us the extent of his office.

---

* See the work entitled: *The Faith of Catholics*, proved from the Scriptures and the Fathers of the first five centuries. By Kirk & Berrington.

Whatever has been taught by Christ, whatever has been defined by the Church, whatever is included in "the deposit of Christian Faith," as generally held by the Church, although not as yet explicitly defined,—whatever is clearly taught by right reason, in the domain not merely of what is called natural science, but even in the domain of morals,—are so many absolute and insurmountable limitations to his teaching authority; for he can teach nothing contradictory to them, for the simple reason that what—in virtue of Christ's promise—we believe him to be infallible in teaching, must be the truth; and all truth, in no matter what order, whether natural or supernatural, is of God, and can never contradict itself. But not only is his teaching authority limited by these negative limitations, by these many things that he cannot teach, because we are already clearly taught their opposite; but even in the domain of truth itself—in the mere natural order for instance, of physical science, of jurisprudence, of political economy, of the mechanical arts, of mathematics, of astronomy, of history—in a word, of a thousand things that may be true—he has no authority to teach. In attempting to do it, he would be simply going beyond his province; and no one should be absurd enough to claim for him any other authority than what might attach to his personal ability and learning. And all this simply because he has been commissioned only as a religious teacher, as is proved by the very words of the decree defining his teaching power; which tell us that he is the appointed teacher only in the sphere of faith and morals, which is the same as to say in the sphere of religious truth. For he is a teacher of morals, only because and as far as morality is necessarily a part of all true religion. This is taught by reason as well as by the words of Christ, when He says: "If any man love me, he will *keep my commandments.*"

Then again, even in this order of religious and moral truth, his teaching prerogative, as far as infallibility is predicated concerning it, is extremely well defined, and extremely limited, by the very words of the decree when it tells us that he possesses this prerogative of inerrancy in teaching, when he teaches "*ex cathedrâ*," "that is, when in the exercise of his office as Pastor and Teacher of all Christians, and in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines that a doctrine is to be held by the universal Church."

It is no part of Catholic faith, it is no teaching of Catholic theology, that the Pope in preaching a sermon, or writing a theological work, may not commit theological blunders, or, for that matter, through ignorance or inadvertence, teach heresy, which he himself, upon his attention being called to it by a better theologian or a more learned private doctor, might, by virtue of his apostolic office, be called upon to condemn.

The amount or number of definable doctrines is by no means unlimited; they must be already contained in "the deposit of faith," as handed down from the Apostles, or they could never be defined at all. We can easily imagine that the time may come when every portion of revealed truth shall be so well defined that there shall be nothing more to define. In fact, at this present moment, it would seem that there must be but few doctrines contained in the deposit of faith, and therefore more or less generally held and taught in the Church, that are not already defined.

We should never, in discussing this question of the teaching power, lose sight of the great truth, that teaching *does* nothing, *creates* nothing, but simply *tells*, or enables us to *see* what is; and, as intelligent and moral beings, we certainly should be glad to know all the truth that we can, to see as much as we can in the religious and moral order. Any man or system that brings more light to my intellect, does certainly not enslave it, by rendering it impossible for it to withhold assent to a clearly perceived truth. The truth liberates us from darkness and ignorance, which is the predisposing condition of slavery. Ignorance assimilates man to the slavish condition of the brute, while truth makes him more of a man, more of a freeman. It was for this reason that the Teacher, in whose name alone the Christian Church teaches anything, has said: "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free"; and His Apostle says: "If the Son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed."

The Pope is an appointed teacher and custodian of the moral order, but he is its servant and not its master. He can and must teach the revealed positive law of God, and even natural morality, that is re-enacted and re-inforced in the order of revelation, as an essential basis of all true religion; but he cannot change one tittle of the natural or the revealed positive law. In his capacity of teacher and judge he may, and must, interpret the law and decide how far and when it may be applicable or not to certain cases. For instance, the Pope, as Christ's appointed teacher of the flock, must teach the obligation of the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill;" and yet he may so interpret the law as to teach that organized society may, by judicial process, kill a murderer, and that in such case killing is no murder. In all such cases the Pope does not pretend to dispense from the law of God, but simply interprets and declares, which right reason itself is very frequently able to do without any prerogative of infallibility, that, in such cases, the law simply does not bind in the intention of God the lawgiver.

The Pope, then, can teach nothing contrary to right reason, to natural morality, to natural justice—nothing to impair the obligation of contracts, or to absolve subjects from their lawful allegiance; for the only authority he enjoys is to do the very opposite, in teaching the obligation of all these things, as a part of the law of God. And if in the middle ages the Popes very rarely and with great reluctance declared tyrant kings, and oppressors of their people, and violators of their oaths of office, to have forfeited their right to the allegiance of their subjects, they were but acting in their acknowledged capacity of the supreme judges of Christendom; and with gravest and maturest deliberation, after fullest hearing of the case, after exhausting fatherly remonstrance and reproof, they simply decided a delicate case of morals for peoples who sought their judgment, and had the will and the power to put it into execution. And at the same time, in the exercise of their apostolic power, they finally cut off these unworthy and sacrilegious children of the Church from her communion; and the common law of Christendom held that an excommunicated tyrant, guilty of the nefarious crimes against justice and religion, that alone could provoke such a sentence, should no longer reign over a free and Christian people.

The present Pope, since the definition of the Vatican Council, viz., on July 20th, 1871, received a deputation of the *Academy of the Catholic Religion*, a literary and theological Society of Rome. He exhorted its members to do their best to refute with all possible care the statements of those who made it their business to misconstrue the Infallibility of the Pope; and he declared it to be a pernicious error, to represent the Infallibility as comprising in itself the right to dethrone sovereigns and to release their subjects from their allegiance. "This right," the Pope said, "has indeed been exercised by Popes in extreme cases; but the right has absolutely nothing in common with Papal Infallibility. It was a result of the *jus publicum* then in force by the consent of Christian nations, who recognized in the Pope the supreme judge of Christendom, and constituted him judge over princes and peoples even in temporal matters. The present situation is quite different. Nothing but bad faith could confound things so different and ages so dissimilar, as if an infallible judgment delivered on some revealed truth had any analogy with a prerogative which the Popes, solicited by the desire of the people, have had to exercise when the public weal demanded it. Such statements are nothing but a mere pretext to excite princes against the Church."

We may hope that, remote as seems the danger of any collision between the rights, or rather the duties of conscience, and the civil government of England, in spite of all Mr. Gladstone's apprehensions—a collision that his expostulation at all events, is more likely to provoke than to prevent, in exciting unduly the fears and the jealousy of the civil government and provoking persecution—such danger is still much more remote in our own favored land, where the rights of conscience are so well understood, and held so dear, that it is incredible that a majority of the people will ever consent to their violation. Happily, among us there is no personal government of a Cæsar to become jealous of the dignity and liberty of the Church. And well may we rejoice in the fact; for Christ has tried Cæsar in every age, and has nearly always found him wanting. May we not then be thankful that we have done with Cæsar, and that *we* can say, with none to make us afraid: "We have no king but Christ?"

Let us be thankful that under the protecting ægis of our beloved country we are protected from the unnatural, unjust and violent union of Church and State, which the Prince Chancellor of the German Empire and some of the Cantons of Switzerland would bring about; and that we enjoy that liberty which Christ demands for His Church—the liberty to carry out His great commission and the liberty to govern herself, and protection for such property as she may legitimately acquire, and which she needs, to pitch her peaceful tents, and to erect her sanctuaries of piety, charity and learning. If any man, whether Cæsar or serf, were to invade any one of her sanctuaries, would not the whole power of the republic, if need were, be there to repel the invader? Let us, then, invoke blessings on the land that acknowledges the rights and the liberty of Christ the King, in maintaining the sacred rights of property, and the far more sacred rights of the sanctuary of man's soul —his rights of conscience. It was for this reason that the late Pope Gregory XVI., weary, no doubt, of the vexations of many a great and many a petty Cæsar, said that he was more truly Pope in this than in any other land. Let us love, then, this land; not only because it is our own, but also because here Christ's Shepherd is most free to exercise his high and holy office. Let us pray that this rational liberty, protected by the strength of union, may endure forever—"*Esto perpetua.*" And throughout the ages may the Republic ever have the blessing of Christ the King.

EDWARD MCGLYNN.

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

1. VITA JESU. *Dionysii Carthusiani Opus.* Printed at Strasburg in 1473.
2. PUBLIC LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. By H. J. Coleridge, S. J. Vol. I., II. London, 1875.

We have taken these two works as the heading of our article, not because we have any intention of critically examining their contents, but because one of them is the oldest, the other the newest work in print, on their common subject, which we have looked at.

One of them is a not very thick volume, in that small folio shape much used in the very early days of printing books. The text is the usual black letter, with large capitals colored by hand, ornamenting the commencement of sundry chapters, while in other chapters you see the blank spaces that should have been so adorned, and were not. Nearly every line presents some form of those contractions which shortened the labor of the penman as he toiled over the pages of his manuscript, and which, though puzzling enough to a modern reader, were then familiar to every one who opened a book. The paper is coarse and strong, and very slightly tinged with the yellow of age. The moths, however, have made their mark; yet not so as to interfere with the print, which is delightfully clear, and still as black as if the book had come from the press only five years ago. Is the manufacture of such printing ink one of the lost arts? We do not see it in modern books.

The other work is from the facile pen of a learned English Jesuit; a son, we believe, of Coleridge the poet and philosopher, and a brother of a distinguished English judge. It is in the ordinary English octavo shape, with such paper, and binding, and clear legible print, as will not fatigue the eye to read nor the hand to hold, nor will the purchase of it drain the purse. Its merits and its cheapness will doubtless secure for it a wide circulation.

Between these two works, printed four hundred years apart in time, how many thousands of volumes on the same subject have been given to the world? To say nothing of the countless editions of the Bible, of the New Testament, of the Gospels, in the various languages of mankind, how many works of the Christian Fathers, of the early Christian Apologists, and of other Christian writers of later times, down to the invention of the art of printing, on this same venerable theme, have been called from the libraries where they lay in manuscripts, almost as forgotten as the dead in the tombs, and were made to live again, by the magic power of this wondrous modern art. Has any year of the last four centuries failed to give life to some new work, perhaps to scores of them, on this same ever thrilling subject? The stream still rolls on. To judge by the numerous announcements of still other new works which the booksellers' circulars of France, England, America and Italy announce for early publication, there is very little likelihood that the stream will run dry in our day.

In truth there is no subject better entitled, for many reasons, to claim the attention of earnest men in every age, than this. Of all the events that have occurred in the history of the world, there is none to be compared, either for importance or for far-reaching and long-enduring influence, to the establishment of Christianity eighteen centuries and a half ago. Its advent inaugurated a revolution such as neither the force of arms, nor the skill of statesmanship, nor the boldest efforts of mere philosophical teaching, could have effected. The most learned, polished, and civilized nations of the earth yielded to it. They surrendered their national traditions, their heathen mythologies, and their Pagan worship, for the new faith and the new worship; and ever since have counted it their greatest honor, to be numbered among the followers of the Crucified One, and to be styled Christian. The history of Christianity becomes henceforth and in its truest sense the history of the civilized world. Its history is the history of the intellect, the heart, and the conscience of humanity. Ignore it, and the historic page is blank. The issues of the past cannot be understood and set forth in their true light, as the issues of the present cannot be discussed and decided, without recognizing and awarding full force to the unceasing influence of Christianity in moulding character, and in restraining or spurring on men to action.

To the historian as to the fervent believer and to the bitter opponent, the chief figure in Christianity is Christ Himself, who stands so prominent that all others are dwarfed beside Him. Around Him its history turns. He is the very soul of it, in a sense infinitely beyond the degree on which the founders of schools of any kind, philosophic, scientific or religious, have ever been known to influence, or can influence their followers. His every word is sacred; His acts and the events of His life are called to mind, and made the theme of devout meditation; His teachings are reverently commented on; His precepts are to be obeyed, and His example to be followed. His person is the object of adoration and of love.

From the beginning it was announced that His is "the only name given to man whereby we can be saved." Worshiped by the Christians, to Him they have ever prayed, to Him they give thanks for favors and blessings received, and from His omnipotence and mercy they hope to obtain whatever of grace and blessing they need for consolation, strength or courage. That one among His followers is most perfect, who most truly is imbued with his Master's spirit and most exactly walks in His footsteps. Christ is everything to them, in life and in death, for this world and for the next. It is the faith of three hundred and fifty millions of the inhabitants of this globe.

On the other hand, Christ stands with equal prominence in the eyes of the opponents of Christianity, by whatever name they are called. They see in Him the central figure, or rather the embodiment of Christianity, and they never fail to make Him the special target; for from Celsus to Renan it has ever been so. Whoever attacked Christianity felt bound to attack the person of Christ specially.

What was the general tenor of argument followed by Celsus, and the other early Jewish and Gentile opponents of Christianity, and what the special points they strove to make against our Saviour, may be learned in some measure from the works of Origen, Tertullian, Justin Martyr, and other early Christian writers, who repelled these assaults. We say, in some measure; for unfortunately, of those early Christian works, a great part has perished. Of the heathen writings we have little more than mere fragments. To judge by these fragments, the civilized world is a gainer by the loss of them. Anything weaker, viler, fouler, can scarcely be imagined. The veriest infidel of to-day would turn from them with nausea. What effect they had in their own centuries, we can understand from one fact: the world rapidly became Christian.

We are more familiar with the spirit of the attacks in modern times. In the last century the attacks were marked by a virulence and coarseness above measure. Led on by Voltaire, D'Alembert, and others of that school, and accepting from them the pass-word: *Ecrasons l'infame*, (*crush the miscreant*,) the infidel opponents of Revelation were profuse in their use of insulting sneers, mocking witticisms, atrocious slanders, and frantic denunciations. Against our Lord they never failed to pour forth bitter and blasphemous tirades. The echoes of their foul language may still be heard from the lips of Garibaldi and some others taught in that school. Their scholars are not all extinct. But Satan seems to have felt that he made a blunder in that mode of attack. At least, he has, since then, entirely changed the order of battle. Did he find that he had miscalculated the power of the influences, natural and supernatural, which rule men? Did he see with dismay, that those coarse outbursts of virulence and blasphemy disgusted men; and that the recoil from them was all in favor of the religion he was attacking?

Anyhow, the present style of attack is quite different: Christianity is now spoken of with words of seeming respect, and its beneficial influence on the world is confessed and lauded. Sometimes, its *quasi*-truth is acknowledged. Was it not the natural, perhaps the necessary development of the religious side of man's nature, called for by the force of things at a certain stage or phase of the progress of the world, superior to every phase, known or unknown, that preceded it, admirably suited to the exigencies of the time of its existence, but itself to be superseded in due time by some other phase or form of religion, something more philosophical and better, when humanity shall have advanced to a more elevated stage of perfection, and shall see truth more clearly than now?

Christ our Lord they speak of in tones of dulcet sweetness. They admire Him. They see clearly that He rose far above His age. He was superior to Socrates, Plato or any other philosopher of antiquity. He surpassed them in the clear intellectual insight into truth, and in His wondrous perception of the needs of mankind, and of the possible modes of meeting them and satisfying them in some measure. The moral code He established was far superior to any the world had hitherto ever heard from the lips of a teacher. He possessed a wondrous force of character which gave Him power to impress on the minds of His immediate followers the thoughts and purposes which filled His own mind and heart, and of stirring them up to a wonderful degree of heroic and life-enduring enthusiasm for their fulfillment. Nay more—what is far more wonderful—he could and did perpetuate and exercise that power and influence on successive generations of men, for centuries after. Undeniable facts like these prove Him to have been truly a phenomenal man, unequalled as yet by any in the history of humanity. If Comte, Renan, and such men of our day surpass Him, it is only through the force of exterior advantages. They have in their favor eighteen centuries of progress and accumulated experience; eighteen centuries during which the human mind has not been standing still. From the standpoint now happily reached, they can discern the truth more clearly than even He, with His marvelous insight, but standing on a level centuries lower. They can take more expanded and more correct views. Hence, they are able to point you out His uncertainties, His mistakes, His failures and His errors. They will trace the influence of these onward in the history of His religion among men; and they will show you where and when, to these original errors and mistakes made by the Founder of Christianity and lying at its root, men have since added others perhaps more pernicious. Whatever is good in Christianity, whether of origin or of development, they approve; whatever in it was suited to the circumstances and needs of man, they commend. If still suited, they wish to see it carefully cherished and preserved. But whatever was untrue, or has become unsuited, they will put aside. In all this they claim to stand up impartially for truth, and for what is beneficial to mankind. As true men, having the strength of their convictions, they must labor strenuously to do so. But they will do it with words of gentleness for the excusable, perhaps the unavoidable errors of the past, and especially with words of reverence, of veneration even, for the Great Founder of Christianity.

It is the *Hail, Rabbi,* and the kiss in Gethsemani, over again.

This modern style of attack, so artful and insidious, is, we are sorry to say it, not without visible effect. Works of this school profess such reverence for religion and religious subjects, seem so candid and impartial in treating them, and are so full of religious forms of speech, that the reader fails to see the true purpose and aim. When the "Ecce Homo" was published anonymously several years ago, was it not a matter of doubt and of argument among many, anything but infidels, whether the brilliant unknown writer really intended to explain and defend Christianity, or to contribute his portion to the grand work of overturning it?

Our Protestant brethren are suffering terribly from such attacks. They have no arms fitted for the encounter. The old time war cry—The Bible, the Bible alone, the Bible interpreted by itself, the Bible interpreted by every man for himself—is valueless now. It neither strikes terror into the enemy, nor gives courage to the heart of him who uses it. It never had any value to count, save where men accepted beforehand and clung tenaciously to the belief of their fathers as to the integrity, the inspiration, and consequently the divine authority of the Bible; and where they similarly accepted, and, at least in a general way, retained without questioning, such interpretations of the Scriptural texts as had been sanctioned by their parents and teachers. Such traditional teaching gave something of definiteness to their belief. But where that was cast aside, and a man struck out for himself—as indeed the fundamental principle of Protestantism required him to do—he usually found himself very soon afloat on a sea of doubts and uncertainty as to the proper number of books in the Bible, as to the accuracy of the text, as to the inspiration and authority of the whole, or what might yet be left to him. He was tossed to and fro by varying and undecided opinions as to the meaning of the text. The present state of the Protestant mind is one of uncertainty sad to contemplate. It is due to the fact, that what only a few did formerly, almost every thinking mind, at all conversant with the literature of the day, is now forced to do at the imperative command of modern science.

The geologist assures him, that since the discoveries of geology as to the past vicissitudes of the earth, the old time-honored interpretation, which his fathers gave, and which he held as to the meaning of the beginning of Genesis, is all wrong, and must be put aside. Perhaps he is willing to put this point alongside that other point, which astronomy made two or three centuries ago, as to the meaning of certain texts of Scripture which had been generally supposed to bear on the question of the motion of the earth or of the sun. But for all this, it is a shock to his own powers of accurate interpretation of Scripture. Possibly it shakes the certainty of his belief in the inspired accuracy of the Sacred Writer. This is but the beginning of his tribulation. The archæologist cometh, with the ethnologist, and the philologist and others, to assure him that they have abundant evidence, part of it contemporary, from the antiquities of Egypt and Mesopotamia, India and China, showing that in those lands men were living in organized nations before the date which his Protestant Bible assigns for the Deluge, nay, even farther back than the date for the Creation. His Bible chronology goes by the board, and he is left like a ship at sea that has been forced to cut away her masts. Ere his mind grows calm again and he can reconcile himself to the new state of thoughts, the paleontologist comes, to throw on his scientific canvass weird, shadowy figures of the prehistoric and the primeval man, who, he says, lived a wild savage life, clothed in skins, dwelling mostly in caves, living by rude fishing and hunting, and for a time ignorant of agriculture, perhaps destitute of language. He clearly roamed over the earth contemporary with the mastodon and the mammoth, long since extinct, away back in the geological periods of time, in the post-pleiocene, perhaps in the pleiocene, and even in miocene eras. These are the latest, and therefore the truest and most reliable of all geological discoveries. He looks at the ghost-like figures, bewildered and perhaps alarmed. Nor are his nerves at all quieted by the scientific chorus of Darwin, Huxley and others, as they sing, that man was not created by God at all, but was developed out of an ape or some other animal, in virtue of the law of struggle for life or of some other inflexible natural law; that man has no spiritual nature whatever, but is wholly made up of particles of matter; that life, and thought, and conscience, are all the production or necessary consequences of the action and interaction and changes among these particles and atoms of matter; that they are all as much regulated by law as the flowing of water down the hillside, or the motion of the moon in her orbit; and that all such changes producing the effects thought due to the presence of a soul, are themselves but the effects of other precedent causes; the whole, one and all, occupying their appropriate places in the grand series of events which are following each other in this material universe—a series, the commencement and ending of which are both unthinkable, and we need give ourselves no concern about them.

Is it wonderful, that in this conflict between his religious belief and science, where, on one side there stand the text—the substance and the authority of which he is by no means sure of—and his powers of interpretation, which he has already learned to distrust, the more he studies the matter; and on the other side, this array of forces of modern science, marching on *en echelon*, with seemingly the confidence of assured victory; the Protestant finally either becomes skeptical, or gives up the whole question as something on which no one can arrive at certainty, and settles down in dim persuasion that doctrines are nothing, that the essence of Christianity is morality, and a vague belief that religion is a very respectable, good thing, especially for women and children.

The position of the Catholic is very different. We believe in Christ and the Holy Church which He founded, and to which He gave full authority to teach, in His name, unto all men and for all time, all things whatsoever He commanded. She is for us the pillar and ground of Truth. From her teaching we learn the doctrines of Divine Revelation. On her authority, or rather on the authority of Christ speaking through her, we believe them. The Scriptures we hold to have been given by divine inspiration, for our edification and instruction; and not, by any means, as a manual or text book, from which to learn the doctrines of Revelation. A text book or manual would of course state these doctrines clearly, fully and in something of a logical order. The simplest inspection of the Bible will show that it is as far removed from this as possible. The very form and character of its contents prove that it was never intended as such a manual. In the Bible the doctrines and precepts of Revelation are of course often alluded to, are often referred to more clearly, are sometimes stated explicitly. Some texts are clear, so clear that the meaning can scarcely be mistaken. Others are not so clear, and others again are so obscure, or so abstruse, that the daring or unskillful may wrest them to their own destruction. Our ability to understand any passage may depend on its own explicitness and clearness, on our own power of mind and acumen, or on our thorough acquaintance with the peculiarities of the special writer, the language or dialect in which he wrote, the manners and customs and habits of thought of those he was addressing, and to whose minds he would, more or less, accommodate his words.

The special circumstances of the time and place must have their weight, and should be known, if we would determine with accuracy and precision the original meaning of any passage of Scripture. Where the Church has defined that a certain passage bears a certain meaning and defines a certain doctrine, we accept that definition as final. But this has been done only in a very few instances. For the rest, we know that God cannot contradict Himself and cannot contradict in Scripture any doctrine which He has taught through His Church. Any interpretation of a text, therefore, which contradicts a doctrine defined or taught by the Church, must be set aside at once as an erroneous interpretation, because it contradicts a known truth. Interpretations of a text which are conformable to the teaching of the Church, are not censurable as to doctrine. Whether they express correctly the meaning of the passage of Scripture, depends on the clearness of the text, which may forbid any other interpretation, or whether this is the meaning in which it appears, from concordant interpretation of the Fathers, that this text has been traditionally understood from the beginning. Otherwise the question must be settled by other rules of criticism.

What we have now said concerns such texts as refer specially to doctrine and morals. There is, however, in Scripture much of historical narrative, and of poetry. The two are sometimes united; for the earliest garb of historical narrative was poetry. Poetry calls for a freedom of expression, which may delight the imagination and give pleasure to the feelings. Oriental poetry goes far beyond our modern poetry in the boldness and the frequency of its tropes, metaphors and other figures suited to Eastern minds and Eastern customs. Then such illustrations gave force, emphasis, beauty, perhaps clearness, to the words, in the minds of the hearers. To us, the same illustrations and ornaments might fail in producing such an effect. Our languages are different, and our habits of thought almost as different. Illustrations most proper and effective in their case might not be understood, or might be even misunderstood by us. Where an illustration is drawn from a fact of nature as viewed or understood by the hearers, and therefore perfectly legitimate in their case, it might well happen that we would take what is simply and really only a poetic or oratorical illustration, for the assertion of a truth. Such was the case in relation to sundry passages of Scripture, which, if taken literally, would mean that the earth stands still, and the sun moves. They were understood literally, and were even quoted in that sense, until the progress of astronomy proved that the sun stood still, and that the earth moved. Then it became evident that the former mode of interpretation was a mistake, that these texts did not assert a fact, and were only poetical or oratorical figures, in which the ordinary *usus loquendi*—the popular phrase or form of language, based indeed on a misconception of facts—was used to convey more forcibly and intelligibly a divine truth.

Let us illustrate our meaning, and the character of the question, by a supposition which is not too extravagant. The Poet Laureate of England, or our own Longfellow, might well indite a few poetic stanzas, speaking of the rising of the Orb of day, of his majestic ascent to the meridian, of his gradual descent along his path in the western sky, of his lingering awhile over the broad prairie, and of his final setting amid the glory of golden and purple clouds. This might be done exquisitely. None would find fault with it, none would misunderstand it. But if those same stanzas fell into the hands of a people holding to the olden Ptolemaic system, and as yet rejecting the Copernican theory, lately presented to them and still unproved, it might very well happen that they would quote the poet as agreeing with them. They might perhaps be brought to understand that this is a poetic conception and license of speech; but it would be difficult to make them realize that the same freedom of speech would be heard in the prosaic conversation of daily life, and would even be found on the pages of scientific books teaching, *ex professo*, the Copernican theory. And all this, without a suspicion anywhere, that the sincerity of their belief in the Copernican system was thereby imperiled, or in the slightest degree put in doubt.

Such latitude in the use of expressions allowed in our modern prosaic matter-of-fact languages, might well prepare us for similar, if not far greater latitude, in the figurative and glowing poetry of the ancients. In such cases, the Catholic student is in no way disturbed by the discussions of critics and the ultimate decision arrived at, whether it be one way or another. To us these questions are to be decided, if they ever can be, by the canons of criticism and by the aid of any light of truth that can be thrown on them. The authority of religion is not involved in them. Our belief of any or of all the doctrines of our holy faith, is not based on any such weak support as our feeble critical ability to decide questions which may have vexed the learned for centuries. It is based on the authoritative decision of that Church which Christ our Lord established for the very purpose of teaching us divine Truth.

This much for that multitude of questions which, so far as they seem to touch religion, involve only the interpretation of texts of Scripture. There are, however, other questions presented of a different character, inasmuch as some of them directly contradict, or indirectly but logically impugn, doctrines defined and positively revealed by God. For example, some of them deny that God created the universe. Huxley seems bent on maintaining that in man there is no spiritual soul. In such cases, we know that the so-called scientist is in error. It is not true science, but a falsely called science, which pretends to correct the teaching of God himself. The scientific world itself, in the long run, generally does execution on such theories. The path of science as it marches on, is marked, as it were, by the dead bones of countless theories, each one of which in its day was hailed as an advanced truth, destined to crush the superstition of Revelation. Such, for instance, was the theory very much in vogue twenty years ago, of the plurality of the human race—a theory tending to deny the doctrine of original sin, and of redemption. Its popularity was at the highest, when Agassiz supported it with his theories of the various centres of creation. Now, in less than one generation, it is so completely dead that we scarcely find a reference to it. The Theory of Development is just now all the rage, and has demolished its predecessor. The arguments hailed only twenty years ago as irrefragable and overwhelming, now only call for a smile. The tide of scientific opinion is running in an exactly opposite direction.

The tide may run for a time in one direction, or in another. The Catholic, like the inhabitant of a city by the sea, knows that his port of Divine Truth ever stands in the same unchanging place, unmoved by these passing currents. The bark that would find safety in its tranquil haven, may have to stem these currents before entering.

But, however, tempting the theme, we must not let our pen run off into questions of the conciliation of the conflicts of some modern so-called scientific theories and the Truths of Divine Revelation, as presented and taught in the Catholic Church. On some other occasion we may feel at liberty to do so. At present we propose to take up the central truth of all Christianity—the Doctrine of the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour—and to consider how it stands now, amid the multitudinous attacks of modern advanced thinkers.

The subject is not inopportune. The seemingly respectful tone of these attacks, their seeming candor, their assumption of deep learning, and the circulation of them everywhere, have produced, as we intimated, a visible and deplorable effect. Many pulpits, claiming the title of Christian, are heard denying and arguing against His Divinity; many others give a very uncertain sound; and still others appear studiously silent, as if unwilling to offend the hearers who created them and by the breath of whose nostrils they live, by broaching a subject on which there exists among them an irreconcilable difference of opinion. Were it not for the Catholic Church, belief in the Divinity of the Incarnate Son of God, our Redeemer, would soon die out among men, perhaps would already be counted among the dreams of the past. She it is who now, as in all times past, proclaims each day her faith in the true Divinity of her Founder, THE WORD MADE FLESH, the Only begotten Son of God, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, who became man, and was crucified for us on Calvary.

It is not easy to sum up in a few sentences the many, and often contradictory, statements made by so many writers in their attacks on the doctrine. We will throw them into the form of an historical statement. This form is sometimes affected by themselves. It gives distinctness to their statements, and it will allow us to grapple with various points separately and in their proper order. We may presume them to speak thus:

1. The Jewish people, at and for some centuries before the birth of Christ, was intensely monotheistic. The idea of a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead was unthought of by them. The idea that a man born of a woman in their own land, and living among them, could be God, because in Him dwelt the Second Person of the Divine Trinity, or for any other reason, could never have entered their minds. It would be directly antagonistic to their most sacred doctrine, and to all their habits of thought.

2. Jesus of Nazareth was born a Jew, was trained and educated as a Jew, and never in all His life went outside the Jewish world, He was sincerely and deeply religious. It would have been specially repugnant to Him to entertain any such doctrine. He certainly never could have invented it. It is positive that He never taught it. It was unknown to Him.

3. It was equally unknown to His Apostles, who were also all of them Jews and, like Him, trained in the school of Jewish religious thought. They never taught it.

4. The early converts to Christianity, whether of the Jewish race, or from Gentilism, not having been taught it, did not hold it. The Jews, in becoming Christians, did not consider themselves severed from their own race; for they continued to frequent the Temple while it stood, to observe the Mosaic law; and this so tenaciously, that they ultimately formed a Christian sect of their own —the Nazarenes—which continued to exist in the fourth century. They would ever naturally hold the Jewish idea of the unity of God. The Gentile converts held the same. They gave up Polytheism, and came to believe the one true God, Creator of all things.

5. It was only long after the death of the Apostles that the Christians, sprung from Gentilism and trained in the philosophic schools, probably of Alexandria, originated this idea of the Divinity of Christ. They found in the teachings of Plato, then universally respected, a certain parallelism of words and thoughts,

which served to prepare minds for the announcement of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and to give it something of a seeming support. The prevalence of polytheistic ideas took away from their minds all antecedent difficulties, so strong in the Jewish mind. The doctrine of the Divinity of Christ was but a practical corollary of that of the Trinity. This doctrine, establishing something of a connection between Christianity and the most popular philosophy of the day, gave a dignity and an importance to Christianity, before the learned world, which otherwise it could not have possessed. For the Christians it was more than an offset to the ignominy of the Cross. The Christian philosopher and apologist found in it full scope for eloquence and for philosophic argumentation, and an ever ready reply to the assaults made on Christianity from the character and the fate of its Founder. And it admirably satisfied the craving of all Christian hearts for something to strengthen and console them amid the taunts and galling insults, to which they were daily subjected, because they were the followers of a despicable crucified Jew. With this doctrine in their hearts, all such shafts fell harmless to the ground. Hence the doctrine was acceptable, spread rapidly; first among the learned and philosophizing classes, of course, and then from them among the mass of Christians of every class. Finally, despite the opposition of Arius and others, it was defined at the council of Nicea in A. D. 325.

6. From that date on, the Divinity of Christ has been the accepted and cherished doctrine of Christianity. But the time has come when the progress of historical criticism, the more scientific discussion of religious truth, (if indeed there be such a thing as real objective truth in religion,) and the investigation of the origin and growth of religious ideas and systems among the different races of men, have enabled scientific minds now to undo this error of fifteen or sixteen hundred years standing, and to reach results more in accordance with the advanced and advancing teachings of pure reason.

This we offer as a fair summary of the historical statements which the opponents of Christianity put forth with an air of confidence, as a decisive argument against the doctrine they are assaulting. We do not, of course, pretend to enter into the minor details, in which they frequently differ among themselves and contradict each other. We group the whole in broad outline.

The first statement does not touch the question at issue, and its accuracy has been controverted. The second statement goes on the supposition that Christ simply gave a fresh development to the existing Jewish religious ideas of His day, and did not go outside of that system. Above all, it ignores the thought that the world received through Him a new revelation from Heaven. of divine truths hitherto unknown to men. This is in perfect accordance with their own theory that any divine revelation, as Christians understand the word—the miraculous imparting of knowledge to the world by God, whether of Himself, or through an inspired envoy—being a miracle, is absolutely impossible. But in an argument with Christians, to assume this theory, which Christians do not admit, or to assume that no divine revelation was made through Christ, is to beg the question,—a feat these advanced thinkers are very much given to perform. However, we shall show that Christ did, in fact, teach this doctrine of His Divinity, that the Apostles taught it, that the earliest Christians held it, and that so far from being the philosophizing figment of a later day, originating long after the time of Christ and the Apostles, it is in fact the original central doctrine of Christianity, around which all other doctrines are grouped in logical order and connection.

Whether or not, before the advent of Christ, the Jewish people possessed any intimation of the Doctrine of the Trinity, or of a plurality of persons in God, or of the Divine character of the Messiah whose coming they looked forward to, are for our subject questions only of secondary importance. If the reply be affirmative, the facts would indeed be a valuable argument in favor of our doctrine. But if negative, it can avail our opponents nothing. Obviously the antecedent ignorance of the Jewish people on these points would be no ground why at a later day, when Christ had come, He might not and should not enlighten their ignorance, and declare to them the truth hitherto unknown.

But in fact, the reply has been given in the affirmative by writers who specially studied the question. The modern Jewish school of thought has been for centuries intensely anti-Christian on these points. Their continued discussions with the Christians in every age, and their efforts to elude the cogencies of Christian arguments founded on passages of the Old Testament, have driven the Jewish controversialists into one groove, which ever since the establishment of their theological and Rabinnical school at Tiberias, in the fifth century, has become more and more rigid. What we wish to ascertain is not what do these later Rabbis say; but what did Jewish Rabbis think and say, before and about the time of our Saviour. To ascertain this, we must go back to such fragments of their sayings and teachings as have been preserved in the Talmud, the Targums and other early Jewish Works. Not to speak of others, this has been done by the late ex-Rabbi *Drach*, who published the results, in his work: *De L'Harmonie entre l'Eglise et la Synagogue* (Paris, 1844). It is certainly strange to find those old Doctors in Israel giving to the future Messiah, time and again, the very incommunicable name of God, *Jehovah;* and in their explanations of Genesis speaking of *God*, of the *Word of God*, and of the *Holy Spirit of God.* It would amply repay one to study out the points which Drach makes, and to ponder and wonder over the quaint Rabinnical quotations that garnish his pages. But we leave the subject to those who may have a special turn for such studies. We have now neither the space, nor the type. We proceed to consider what is more important—the question involved in the second proposition.

Did Christ our Lord, in teaching His disciples or the crowds that listened to Him, declare the doctrine of His own divinity? This is the key of the question. The first evidence is manifestly to be sought in His own words, as given to us by the sacred Evangelists. What, then, does He say of Himself?

I. He declares Himself greater than every person and everything most sacred in the eyes of the Jewish people. He is greater than the prophet Jonas, (Matt. xii. 41,) greater than Solomon in all his wisdom, (Matt. xi. 42,) greater than the most Holy Temple (Matt. xii. 6). Prophets and just men yearned to see Him and His works, and to hear His teachings, and attained not the object of their earnest expectation (Matt. xiii. 17, Luke x. 34). He is greater than Moses, who wrote of Him, (John v, 46,) than Abraham who rejoiced to see His day, who saw it and was glad (John viii. 56). He is greater than John the Baptist, who was sent to announce Him, and who was greater than any born of woman (Matt. xi. 10–11). He is the Son of David, whom David in Spirit calls Lord (Matt. xxii. 43). He is Lord even of the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 8).

II. He claims the right to exercise, and does exercise the power which His hearers held God only could exercise. They believed that God only could forgive sins. He claims this power as His own. "The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins" (Luke v, 24). He exercises it. "Be of good cheer, son, thy sins are forgiven thee" (Matt. ix. 2). He transmits it to His disciples. "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them" (John xx. 23).

So truly does He wield this power that He is Lord of Paradise, and can assure it to the repentant robber. "Amen, Amen, I say to thee; this day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise" (Luke xxiii. 43).

The Jews worshiped the true God—Creator of heaven and earth—just and merciful, who will reward the good and punish the wicked, and whose divine power and authority will be made gloriously manifest in His judgment of the world. Christ claims for Himself the authority of sovereign Judge. He at the end of the world shall send His angels to gather out of His kingdom all scandals. He shall cast out them that work iniquity, and shall make the just to shine as the sun in the Kingdom of their Father (Matt. xiii. 40, 41, 42, 43). For unto Him hath all judgment been given by the Father (John v. 22). Unto this judgment He shall come in the glory of the Father and attended by the angels as His servants. He shall sit upon the seat of His majesty, and all nations shall be gathered together before Him, and His judgment shall be absolute and irrevocable (Matt. xiii. 41; xvi. 27; xxiv. 30; xxv. 31–46; xxvi. 64). Ought not this to be enough? And yet we have scarcely crossed the threshold. We have but a glimpse of the glory that shines within the divine Temple of Truth.

III. Throughout His ministry He teaches, not as the Scribes and Pharisees who declare the law as given of old. He speaks with His own original authority. To Him the highest mysteries are but natural truths, clear to Him as those of the world around. He issues His commands as one having power. If He does away with the traditions and rules of the Synagogue, He establishes new precepts of His own authority: precepts which shall bind all mankind, and are of equal force with the laws given of old by the Almighty through His Servant Moses. And the warrant for all this is: "But I say to you" (Matt. v. 21–48).

IV. He foretells the future, not awaiting an hour of vision or inspiration like the prophets of old, and as if raised beyond and outside of Himself, but because He knows all things (John xxi. 17). There was nothing hidden from Him in all nature, not even in man (John ii. 25), not even the secret wishes of man's heart or the secret thoughts of his mind (Matt. ix. 4; xvi. 8; Mark ii. 8; Luke v. 22).

This is not in Him a borrowed knowledge, for He is the light of the world (John viii. 12.) He is the wisdom of God that sendeth the prophets, and which no adversary shall be able to resist and gainsay (Matt. xxiii. 34; Luke xi. 49; xxi. 15). He is what no man before Him could claim to be,—the Way, the Truth and the Life (John xiv. 6).

V. He styles Himself explicitly the Son of God (Matt. xxvii. 43; John ix. 35). And this not as man may be in a vague sense; not as all men are by their possession of reason and intelligence, nor as some men are by the possession of sanctifying grace, and the holiness of their lives; but in a special sense peculiar to Him alone.

His disciples acknowledge it (John vi. 70). The devils cry out to Him: What have we to do with Thee, Jesus, Son of God (Matt. viii. 29). It is His own title. By it He is distinguished from the prophets. *They* are the servants of the house-holder, whom He sent to the husbandmen. *He* is the Son, the real true Son, whom the Father sent to them in the last place, and of whom they said, "This is the heir: let us kill Him, and we shall have the inheritance" (Matt. xxi. 33–38).

VI. This Sonship is not a Sonship vaguely or improperly so termed. It is a truth—a mystery which flesh and blood cannot teach, but which is revealed from heaven, and such that they are blessed to whom it has been revealed (Matt. xvi. 16–17).

It is real and true. He is the Son of God, the only Son of God; the Son of the Blessed God; the only begotten Son of God (John iii. 16–17), by giving Whom—"that whosoever believeth in Him may not perish, but may have life everlasting"—God has given the most signal proof of the immensity of His love for man (John iii. 16).

VII. The mystery of the character and qualities of this Sonship is clearly set forth in many passages of His teachings. He has not been called and sent by God, as Moses and the prophets were, but He proceeds from God (John viii. 42). He came out from God; He came forth from the Father (John xvi. 27, 28; xvii. 8). He will leave the world and go again to the Father. He cometh down from Heaven, where He was before, and whither men shall see Him ascend again (John vi. 33–63). The Baptist bore witness that this is the Son, whom the Father loveth and into whose hands He hath given all things, and testifieth what He hath seen and heard (John iii. 31–35). Christ Himself declared that no man hath seen the Father. He said to the Jews, "You are from beneath, I am from above; you are of the world, I am not of this world" (John viii. 23). "I am not come of myself, but He that sent me is true, whom you know not; I know Him, because I am from Him, and He hath sent me" (John vii. 28, 29). So clearly and so emphatically did He present this thought, that He could not be misunderstood. Martha summed up the instruction she and others had received, "Yea, Lord, I have believed that thou art Christ, the Son of the living God, who hath come into this world" (John xi. 27).

VIII. This pre-existence in eternity, in the bosom of the Father, which she acknowledged and which is implied in the passages we have quoted, is still more distinctly declared in others. He existed before Abraham. (John viii. 38.)

The Father loved Him before the creation of the world (John xvii. 24.) And He prays to the Father, "Glorify Thou Me with Thyself, with the glory which I had before the world was, with Thee" (John xvii. 5.) He claims for Himself, most emphatically even the incommunicable name of God, JEHOVAH, the distinctive name of the one true God. "Amen, Amen, I say to you, before Abraham was made, I AM" (John viii. 58.)

IX. He establishes what in the language of to-day is called, if we may use it in this sacred theme, a *solidarity* with God. God gives grace, and no man can come to Christ except the Father draw him.

Christ is the fountain of grace; He giveth living water, whereof they that drink shall not thirst forever, and shall come to everlasting life (John iv. 10, 13, 14). When He shall be lifted up from the earth on the cross, He shall draw all things to Himself (John xii. 32). He applies literally to Himself the prophecies which Isaiah (xxxv. 5) and Malachi (iv. 5; iii. 2) uttered concerning Jehovah the Lord of hosts; and shows how they must be really and literally fulfilled in Himself.

Yet while teaching thus strongly the mysterious union which exists between the Father and Himself, He is equally careful to indicate the distinction that exists between them; a distinction as mysterious as the union. He hath not come of Himself. The Father hath sent Him (John vii. 28). All that He has, He holds from the Father. He does nothing of Himself: as the Father hath taught Him, these things He speaks (John viii. 28).

His doctrine is not His own, but the teaching of Him that sent Him (John vii. 16). And He speaks emphatically, "Amen, Amen, I say unto you, the Son cannot do anything of Himself, but what He seeth the Father doing; for what things soever He doeth, these the Son also doeth in like manner (John v. 19). If he has life in Himself, it is because the Father hath given Him to have it (John v. 26). He and the Father are two witnesses whose testimony may not be refused (John viii. 16, 17). They are distinct and yet in unity. "I and the Father are one" (John x. 30). Whosoever sees Him seeth the Father, because He is in the Father and the Father is in Him (John xiv. 9–11).

This union is manifested in works. "My Father worketh until now; and I work" (John v. 17). Whatsoever things He doth, these the Son also doth in like manner (v. 19). "The Father raiseth up the dead, and giveth life: So the Son also giveth life to whom He will" (v. 21). "As the Father hath life in Himself, so He hath given to the Son also to have life in Himself" (v. 26). No man can snatch aught out of the hand of the Father: no man shall pluck the sheep out of the hands of the Son (John x. 28–29). No man knoweth the Son but the Father: neither doth any one know the Father but the Son (Matt. xi. 27). The Father sendeth the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, in the name of the Son (John xiv. 26). The Son sendeth the Paraclete from the Father, the spirit of Truth, who proceedeth from the Father (John xv. 26; xvi. 7).

The Father glorifieth the Son, (John viii. 54,) and He is glorified in the Son (John xiii. 31, 32). All things whatsoever the Father hath, are the Son's (John xvi. 15; xvii. 10). The works which He does are done by the Father who abideth in Him (John xiv. 10). Whatsoever you ask the Father in My name, He will give it you (John xv. 16; xvi. 23). "Whatsoever you ask the Father in My name, that will I do" (John xiv. 13).

Finally, Christ receives from men the same homage and worship which they gave to God. " You believe in God; believe also in Me" (John xiv. 1). The great commandment is to love God with our whole heart, and our whole soul, and with all our strength. Christ claims that we love Him more than father or mother or relatives—more than our very lives. Adoration is due to God alone. because of His divine majesty and power, and infinite perfections, Christ proclaims it. Yet to honor Him, is to honor the Father; and He allowed the man born blind, to whom He had given sight, to fall down and adore Him (John ix. 38). He allowed the pious woman to adore Him (Matt. xxviii. 9), and after walking on the waters and calming the storm, He allowed His disciples that "were in the boat to come and adore Him, saying: "indeed, Thou art the Son of God" (Matt. xiv. 33). And when Thomas, convinced of His resurrection, answered and said unto Him: "My Lord and my God," He did not chide the Apostle: on the contrary, Jesus said to him: "Because thou hast seen Me, Thomas, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen and have believed" (John xx. 28, 29).

It would be easy to quote many other equally remarkable expressions of Jesus Christ, concerning Himself and His relations to God: but these are sufficient. Made familiar to us from our childhood, we are not so sensibly struck, as a stranger would be, with their unusual and mysterious character. No messenger or servant of the true God has ever used such expressions. Neither Moses, nor Samuel, nor David, nor Isaiah, nor Elias, nor John the Baptist, nor any one of the Apostles or Evangelists, nor any holy man of God since their time, has ever dared to speak of himself in this manner. In the use of this language concerning Himself, Christ stands alone of all men that have walked on earth.

What is the intrinsic meaning of His words? What is the meaning of that SONSHIP of which He so often speaks, and which He vindicates to himself so exclusively? What does He mean by His being seated at the right hand of the Power of the Father? Why thus picture Himself to us, as placed on the right hand of God the Father, seated with Him on the very Throne of the Deity in Heaven, while patriarchs and prophets, and all the saints of God, and all the angels of Heaven, praise Him and minister unto Him? Does this mean that He is true God, equal to the Father, and adored by the Heavenly court as the Father is, and that He claims the same worship from men on earth? May we not, rather, ask: Can the words be made to mean anything else than this?

But, it is objected, if Christ really meant to teach the doctrine of His Divinity, why did He not distinctly state it, in so many simple, unmistakable words? Why did he not say clearly: *I am the true*

God, who have come down from Heaven, and have taken to myself a human body and a human soul. I am God incarnate." Why has he always stopped short of this, saying only: "*I am the Christ, the only begotten Son of the living God.*" Does not the studious avoidance of the direct statement, and the studious use of other words, prove that, whatever may be the meaning of the words He used, they were at least chosen and used for the very purpose of excluding the assertion of a real divinity?

This is an objection often heard. Yet, strong as it appears, it is only a bubble, that will burst at the first touch. If we cite in reply to it, as we well may, certain passages of Scripture, which imply the possession by Christ of divine attributes, we are generally met by minute questions of refined critical interpretation, or by further remarks impugning the accuracy with which His words have been recorded; and thus raising the question of the authenticity and the authority of the Gospels. Into this question the present is not the proper time for us to enter. We here assume both; so far at least as the genuineness of the expressions of Christ quoted by us is concerned. We take it for granted that He really did use them. But we will so shape our answer as to rely on facts of history, rather than on the interpretation of certain texts.

What then, we ask, is the real meaning and import of the phrase, *Son of God*, so often used by Christ, and exclusively applied to Himself.

We maintain that this expression, *Son of God*, used by our Saviour, was then, and for that people, a distinct and clear avowal of his Divinity, and not a falling short of such avowal, as the objection asserts; and furthermore, that the form of words proposed instead, as more explicit, was not used by our Lord for the simple reason that such words would have led His hearers into error on another point.

To seize the full and true meaning of words, we must know something of the mode of thought peculiar to those addressed, and of the subjects which occupied their minds when the words were spoken. For instance, twenty years ago, if a politician announced to his constituents that he was for extending to every man in the land the rights of American citizenship, he would at once be understood to oppose Know-nothingism, and to deprecate any change in the then existing naturalization laws: for these were the questions then agitating our political world. Eight years ago, the same words would have been understood as favoring the extension of the right of voting and of eligibility to office, to the lately emancipated negroes. For a new question, unthought of at the earlier date, had arisen. It was a question so different from the former one, that many who spoke the words sincerely, as against Know-nothingism, were utterly unwilling to repeat them as in favor of the negro. And this without inconsistency, and while they were positive that they had not, in the meanwhile, changed their political convictions. Thus we see that the true import of words depends on something else than their mere utterance. The character of the speaker and the hearers, and the circumstances of the times, are all to be taken into account. How many errors and mistakes are due to a neglect of this principle!

The Oriental mind is keen, subtle and active—we might say, of a decided metaphysical cast. At least it was eminently so fifteen hundred and two thousand years ago. It retains something of that character yet, despite centuries of the tyranny of Islamism. A cynic of other religions might sneeringly intimate, that he looked on them as industriously occupied in splitting hairs.

The Western mind, on the contrary, prides itself on being quite practical and matter-of-fact, in dealing with the questions that come before it. An Oriental would say that it is dull and obtuse: so obtuse, as often to embrace two systems at the same time, without perceiving contradictions between them, visible to him at a glance; and so dull, that in practice a course of action may be followed even for a long time, without any suspicion on our part that it conflicts with maxims or theories to which we profess to adhere. He wonders that we make so little account of intrinsic contradictions and logical absurdities. He admits and admires our boldness and power in outward action: he thinks little of our capacity for reasoning. He will stroke his beard complacently as he says that we have the empire of matter, but the Orientals retain that of the intellect.

Seven centuries ago, the scholars of the West gave themselves up to metaphysical studies, with as much, perhaps more ardour, than ever the Orientals did. We have the fruits of their labors in the hundreds of folio volumes, containing the works of the mediæval Scholastics, and filling the lower shelves of our libraries. Who reads them now? Is it possible to translate them into a modern language? Where will we find words to express the refinements, and the delicate shades of abstruse thought, and the shadowy distinctions, which were their playthings or their weapons in intellectual warfare? One would have to do now with our English tongue, what the Scholastics did with the Latin—coin a multitude of new words for special use, and modify considerably the meanings of old ones.

Our habits of thought are very different from those of the Orientals in the age when Christ spoke, and for centuries before and after. It is a singular fact, that all or nearly all the errors and heresies which the Church of God had to combat in the East, during the first four centuries of Christianity, turned on the attributes of God, on the Trinity, and the Person of Christ—all of them the result of this rage for abstruse metaphysical speculations. The errors and heresies and religious questions originating and discussed in the West (save among the Scholastics) touch, on the contrary, the human side of Christianity—the forgiveness of sins, man's need of grace, his free-will, the authority of the Church, and the number and value of the Sacraments to be used by man. This distinction is striking, and indicates a marked difference in mental characteristics.

We doubt if that difference were ever greater in practice, than we have made it now. We have a happy knack of throwing ourselves into any question that may arise, and of discussing it, paying little or no regard to the bearing of the terms we use on any other question. The first question settled, we are quite ready to enter on another with equal zest, feeling ourselves not at all committed by the words we have used in the previous discussion, and disposed to exercise a similar liberty of terms in our present discussion. We argue, for instance, in favor of the existence of a Personal God. We mean by the words, and we contend that there really does exist, a Supreme Being, eternal, intelligent, self-existent, and all-powerful; who created the universe out of nothing, and who rules it. We mean that He really exists in Himself, and apart from that universe of created things, which are but the works of His hand. We contend that He is not the mere sum total of all existing things, as some Pantheists teach, or the sum total of the forces or laws that rule the universe, as others hold; that He is not another name only for nature, whatever is meant by that very vague word. We repudiate the assertion that He is perhaps nothing more than a mere ideal conception, created and existing only in man's own intellect—a personified summing up of our moral and religious notions, cravings and instincts. All this we argue against; and when we have proved satisfactorily the existence of a Personal God, we are ready to pass on to the consideration of his Divine Nature, and profess ourselves ready to discuss the Doctrine of the Trinity. But here the Oriental will step in and tell us that this is no longer for us an open question; for we have already decided it. We have already committed ourselves to the Jewish and Socinian idea of the Godhead, and, by our own language, have excluded the Trinity; we have argued for the existence of a *Personal* God. If we believed the Trinity, we should have said, a *Tri-personal* God.

This may seem to us the trifling of hypercriticism, deserving only no more than a passing smile. To the Oriental mind, however, it is a serious matter. What we have written is but the remark and remonstrance made to ourselves by an acute, clerical friend from

Aleppo, who was very much shocked, when once in conversation with him we happened to use the accepted English phrase *personal God*, translating it literally. His mind seized at once on the doctrinal meaning of the word Personal, and followed it out to its logical consequences. We on, the contrary, used it, as it is customarily used, only in a loose conversational sense, without any thought of being tied down to the consequences, at once and almost instinctively drawn by the Oriental mind.

Bearing in mind this special trait of the Oriental intellect, then roused to activity by the contest between Religion and the Eastern and Grecian systems of Philosophy, let us take up the words of our Saviour and weigh them well, bearing especially in mind the questions of that time, as seen by the Jewish mind. We shall see—we can scarcely fail to see—how distinctly they sometimes express, how logically they at other times imply, the great doctrines of Christianity concerning God and Christ. We shall see that this is the sense in which they were then understood by His hearers, whether disciples who yielded belief, or Jews who refused to receive His teaching.

The doctrine of Christianity is, that in the one true eternal God there are three distinct persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. In this divine mystery of the Holy Trinity there is neither a division of the one Godhead, nor a confounding or mingling of the three Divine Persons.

Moreover, the Second Person of this Divine Trinity, God the Son, became man by taking to himself a human body and a human soul; was born of a Virgin mother; taught in Judea; and died on the cross for the redemption of man. He was known among men as JESUS OF NAZARETH. He was God and man.

Both of these doctrines are asserted or implied in the teachings of Christ, whenever he declares that he is the Son of God, the only begotten Son of the Father; who was with the Father before the world was created; who was in the Father, and the Father in Him; who was one with the Father, and yet distinct from Him; who had come down from Heaven into this world, and would return to Heaven again.

The first thought or logical truth, that presents itself to the mind, as we contemplate the relation of sonship, is the identity of nature. The son must be a person distinct from the father, but of the same nature with the father. This is obvious to every mind. The son of a peasant is another peasant, the son of a noble is another noble. But to the Oriental mind, especially to the Semitic, and more especially to the Jewish mind, this idea stood out in bold relief. The importance they gave to the matter of descent, the care with which their family genealogies were preserved, their very distinction into tribes, led them to give special prominence to this thought. The son of Aaron was a Priest; the son of Levi was a Levite: the son of David was of royal blood.

When Christ declared to them that he was truly the Son of God, the first thought that flashed across the minds of His startled and astonished hearers was this: "Who ever before preached to us that the true God hath a Son, a Son like the Father, and possessing the divine nature of that Father? The false gods whom the heathens worship, have sons, who are false gods like their fathers. The Persians believe that divine sons give birth to other divine sons. The heathens are ever speaking of such things. But we worship one true God, the only God, who revealed Himself to our fathers as a jealous God. When was it ever said before, that He too had produced a Son of His own divine nature? What does this man really mean? Does He claim that He is really such a son of God, and equal to the Father in nature and honor? Can He mean this?" When they heard Him go on to speak of being with the Father before the world was made,—from eternity; of His coming down from the Father and His return to the Father; when He told them that they knew not whence He was, and could not understand the Divine mode of His generation; that only the Father knew the Son; when he claimed union with the Father so intimate that the Father worked in Him, and He in the Father; and claimed that all men should honor the Son as they honored the Father—these and His other words made it impossible to misunderstand Him. That the Father was God, they knew. It was the most sacred doctrine of their nation. But that there is a Son of God, partaking of His Divine Nature, this Jesus of Nazareth who is speaking to them, they are not willing to believe. And what are those other words that He uttereth at times, about the Spirit of God whom the Father will send, and whom the Son will send? Is this another Divine person? Are there more persons than one in God? We cannot comprehend what He says. But that He does say it, and insist on it, our own ears bear witness.

That the Jews so understood Him, is clear from their own words and acts. "They sought the more to kill Him, because . . . He said God was His Father, making Himself equal to God" (John v. 18). They repeat the charge. "For a good work we stone Thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that Thou, being a man, makest Thyself God" (John x. 33,). When He stood for trial before the high priest, and held His peace until, in response to the solemn adjuration, He broke that divine silence and emphatically avowed Himself the Son of God, His words were still taken in the same sense. For "the high priest rent his garments, saying: He hath blasphemed; what further need have we of witnesses?

Behold, now you have heard the blasphemy: what think you? But they answering said: He is guilty of death" (Matt. xxvi. 63–66.) And still again, in the same sense did the Jews say of Him to Pilate. "We have a law, and according to the law He ought to die, because He made Himself the Son of God" (John xix. 7).

It is impossible to make a mistake here. Words and acts alike forbid it. They are as clear as the sunlight. The Jews did understand Christ to claim for Himself a true, veritable Sonship of God, which made Him a partaker of the Divine Nature, equal to God, thus making Himself God. This was the blasphemy of which they accused Him, and for which they condemned Him.

Had He claimed to be only a prophet or messenger of God, they would have hailed Him with joy. It was what the nation yearned for. Had he even announced Himself as an angel of God coming in the form of a man to do God's work among them, the idea would not have been strange to them. Had not angels again and again appeared among men, to Abraham, to Jacob, to Daniel, to Tobit? There was no difficulty. They would have welcomed and honored Him. The higher His grade in the angelic host, perhaps the higher would be the honors to be paid to Him; the more earnest and joyous their welcome. But when He claimed to be the veritable, eternal SON of the ETERNAL GOD—when He was clearly understood to claim a participation of the very divine nature of God—this was a trenching on the glory of the jealous God of their fathers, a blasphemy which could be fitly punished only with death. They would have been right, were the claim untrue. A blasphemy of deeper dye cannot be imagined, than such a claim, unless Christ be in truth the Divine Son of the Living God.

This is evidently what they understood Him to teach. So earnest were they, that they charged Him repeatedly with this blasphemy, and again and again took up stones to put Him to death; and finally did crucify Him, thinking they were giving glory to God.

Did He ever intimate that they misunderstood Him? Did He ever explain away His strong expressions? Quite the reverse. On one occasion, when they charged Him with blasphemy and sought to stone Him, (John v.,) He chides them for not believing Him. He exhorts them to believe, and He develops His meaning in several of those strong, unmistakable expressions which we have already quoted. On a second occasion (John x.) He arrests their headlong fury for a moment, as He did at other times, by an apt quotation from the Scripture; He again fixes their attention, and then goes on to insist more strongly than before on the doctrine which had offended them—"The Father is in Me, and I in the Father" (John x. 38)—so strongly, that their fury bursts forth again. They seek at once to take Him, and He escapes out of their hands. So, too, on a third occasion, before the high priest. Not only did Christ, when adjured in the name of the living God, avow Himself the Son of God; but He went on to declare explicitly, that hereafter they should see Him sitting at the right hand of the power of God, and coming in the clouds of heaven to judge the world (Matt. xxvi. 64). In the day of God's Judgment of the world, they would have visible evidence of the grand truth which now they denied, and for announcing which they were about to condemn Him.

Christ takes back no word He has spoken, abates not one iota of the claim He asserts, to be the Son of the Father. His words are truth, and everlasting life. He has come to His own: His own receive Him not.

How the Jews understood His words, we have seen beyond all doubt. Their words and their acts made it perfectly clear. We now see that, on His part, Christ confirmed them in that sense; and by insisting on it, gave a second and more emphatic expression to it. He was in truth the Son of God, one with the Father in the possession of the Divine nature.

How His disciples understood him, and what they held this Divine Sonship to mean, will be made equally clear, when we come to examine how they spoke and what they taught concerning His Divinity.

We may add here that the phrase, *Son of God*, occupies a prominent place in the early Christians' writings, and is used especially in their discussions with the Jews. The same fundamental idea, distinction of persons and community of nature, between the Father and the Son, is ever understood; sometimes it is plainly expressed. Thus in the Epistle to Diognetus, an early Christian work, the unknown writer of which says (chap. xi.) that he was a disciple of the Apostles, and had become a teacher of the Gentiles, we read (chapter v.) concerning the ministry of Christ, the Son of God, sent by the Father unto this world: "As a king sends his son, who is also a king, so sent He Him: As God, sent He Him; As Saviour, sent He Him." The king's son is a king. The Son of God is God. Similarly, Justin Martyr, in his *First Apology* (chap. 63), says: "The Jews know not that the Father of the universe has a Son: who also, being the first begotten Word of God, is even God." Athenagoras, in his *Plea for the Christians* (chap. x.), gives expression to the same thought. This is the essential philosophic idea of Sonship, the very thought to which the mind of the hearer was directed. The term, *Son of God*, was a phrase the full meaning and import of which the Jews would understand clearly, and perhaps much more readily, than they would the other term, *Word of God*, less familiar to them, but one which became more acceptable to the Greeks and Hellenizing Christians; and which, having the sanction of the Gospel of St. John, and expressing his belief, will in its turn call for our consideration, when we treat of the testimony of the beloved disciple as to the Divinity of his Master.

It is evident, therefore, that the words of Christ: "I am the Christ, the Son of God," so far from falling short of a full and explicit declaration of His divine nature, were precisely those which conveyed to the minds of his hearers a distinct statement of it, and which, furthermore, expressed the doctrine that his Divine Personality was distinct from that of the Father; and, by this statement, led them on towards a knowledge of the mystery of the Holy Trinity.

Had he said: "I am the Christ, the incarnate God," His hearers would indeed understand Him to declare His own Divinity. But they would have learned nothing of the distinction of persons in the Godhead. Ignorant of this doctrine, they would have held that God the Father, of whom alone they had knowledge, had become incarnate. They would have held that Jesus of Nazareth was God the Father, and not God the Son. The words used by Christ guarded them against this error.

Indeed, at a later day, by over-much subtilizing on the doctrine of the Trinity, and thus doing away with the proper distinction of the Divine Persons, sundry eastern Christians were led on to coalesce into a sect called the Patripassians. Their chief error was holding, that it was the Father who was made flesh, and was born of the Virgin Mary; who suffered under Pontius Pilate, and was crucified for our redemption. The strongest arguments against them were drawn by the orthodox Christians from the words of Christ Himself, as He teaches the distinct personality and the proper works of the Son of God.

We have shown, however imperfectly, that the words of our Saviour contain ample proof of His Divinity. The same doctrine may be established from the character of His miracles. The teachings of the Apostles supply still other evidences of it; and the abundant testimony at hand to show that the early Christians of every class—the immediate disciples of the Apostles—believed it, supplies historical evidence, which fully refutes the assertion, so confidently made, that this doctrine of the Divinity of Christ originated only at a later period, in the minds of certain philosophizing Christians. But to treat these points with the fullness which they are entitled to, would demand far more space than is now at our disposal. We may treat of them hereafter. Our readers will acknowledge that we have already taxed their time and patience sufficiently for this first number of our Review.

P. N. Lynch.

MODERN PHYSICISTS AND THE ORIGIN OF MAN.

1. Addresses of Professors Tyndall and Huxley before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1874.
2. GENTILISM: *Religion Previous to Christianity*. By Rev. Aug. J. Thebaud, S. J., New York: D. and J. Sadlier & Co., 1876.

The hostility of the majority of modern physicists to Christianity shows itself plainly in their theories of the origin of matter and of man. They are professedly indifferent to the bearing of their views upon the statements of Sacred Scripture; and they attempt to rule those statements entirely out of the discussion; but in this they only reveal the more clearly their real animus. For, however diversely the statements of Scripture may be construed on some points, they declare, as all agree, that matter is not eternal nor self-existent, that man has his origin not in any "potency" inherent in matter, but in the creative will of God, and that man has not developed into the possession of intellect and of will, but was endowed with them at the moment of his creation. Around these statements and corroborating them, has gathered, in the course of ages, an accumulation of confirmatory evidence in comparison with which the proofs, that support the most firmly established facts of physical science, are weak. These statements, therefore, are, to say the least, entitled to respectful consideration. They are "in possession," and before a writ of "ouster" can be issued against them and executed, a title superior to theirs must be conclusively shown. In other words, the burden of proof rests upon those who impugn, directly or indirectly, the statements of Scripture. When the hypotheses of physicists declare, or imply, that man was not created, but was evolved from a "protoplasm," by a power inherent in matter; that, by the operation of that same power, the protoplasm was carried through successive stages of development, until it became an anthropoid ape, then a savage man, and at last, after millions of years, an intellectual Celt or Saxon, it is entirely legitimate to reply, "We refuse to accept your theory, because it contradicts divine revelation."

We know very well, that this is decried as dogmatism. Whether it be dogmatism or not, it is a logical answer. There are certain axioms, upon which mathematical science rests. When results are shown to be in accordance with those axioms, they are accepted as determinate conclusions. Suppose a scientific dreamer should adopt a hypothesis, which contradicted those axioms or their consequences, and, when confronted with the contradictions, should reply, "I rule mathematics entirely out of my field of thought; if mathematics comes in the way of my speculations, so much the worse for it," such a scientist would be considered a fit inmate for a mad-house. Yet he would not be a whit more irrational, in his method of arguing, than are many modern physicists in the posture which they assume towards Christianity. For Christianity is a FACT; and a fact of greater moment, than all the physical facts which scientists gather around their speculations about matter, its forces, forms, and modes of existence. Christianity, therefore, cannot be thus unceremoniously thrust out of view. Around Christianity, too, other facts have clustered, which must be considered and duly disposd of, before the way can be opened for even commencing the summary procedure which many, perhaps a majority, of modern scientists advocate.

If these savans were of one mind either as to the facts, which they include within the field of their speculations, or as to what they infer from those facts, their treatment of Christianity would be less obviously irrational, if not more excusable. But they disagree both as to facts and conclusions.

There is another point, which should always be borne in mind in estimating the importance of the theories of physical scientists, viz: that. in their investigations, they use the inductive method.

They are shut out, therefore, by the very method which they employ, from reaching certainty in their conclusions. The utmost they can claim is probability. Induction is very well in its place, useful for arranging and classifying ascertained facts. But by induction nothing can really be proved. Induction starts from particulars; the conclusion, consequently, is always broader than the premises upon which it rests.

Besides, the inductive method is applicable only to the relative and finite. It is as absurd, therefore, to attempt by induction to reach conclusions respecting the absolute and infinite, as it would be to expect a stream to rise above its source. Induction starts from a hypothesis, in other words, a guess. It empirically arranges about the hypothesis the results of investigations into physical phenomena, facts, real or suppositious. If the facts agree with the hypothesis, the hypothesis is held to be correct. Yet all those facts may possibly be explained, quite as well, by some other hypothesis entirely different; or, in the lapse of time, other facts may be discovered, which prove the hypothesis untrue.

The history of the physical sciences records many instances of this; many, too, that are quite recent. We mention, as examples, the theory that chemical compounds are formed by the combination of the ultimate particles, called atoms, of elementary substances; a theory now generally regarded by physicists as untenable, yet still almost universally employed to explain chemical reactions. Again, until quite recently the change in the lungs of the color of the blood was explained by the oxidation of the iron contained in it; and the heat of the body was attributed to the union in the lungs of the oxygen of the inspired air with the carbon of the blood; yet it is now known, that these theories are in fact untrue. Again, previous to the last century the very existence of oxygen was unknown. Yet this is one of the most active, indeed we may say, the most active, and all-pervading of all elementary substances—if there be elementary substances, and if oxygen is one of them—neither of which is at all certain. It enters into the air we breathe; it forms eight-ninths, by weight, of all the water on the face of the globe, or that floats as vapor above it; it forms, no one can tell, what proportion of the globe itself, and it combines with every known substance, one only excepted. Its discovery, it is scarcely too much to say, upset the whole fabric of physical science; it completely revolutionized chemistry, the most venerable of all the physical sciences excepting astronomy; it did the same thing to mineralogy; it totally changed, or rather re-created the theories of combustion, respiration, nutrition, of the growth of plants and animals, of the metamorphosis of tissues, and of every thing that belongs to physiology. Now what has happened may happen again. Scientists now strongly suspect that oxygen is a compound and not an elementary substance, and that there is a good deal still to be learned about it. And, what has been said about oxygen and chemistry, might be said with equal truth about other established (?) facts and theories of the physical (so-called) sciences. Some day—no one knows how soon—they may all be upset by some unlooked for discovery; and the accepted doctrines of "protoplasms" and "continuous development," may be discarded with as little ceremony, as have those of "monads" and "germ-cells."

As we have already said, it is impossible to arrive at certainty by the inductive method. Yet physicists seriously propose by this method of argumentation to thrust God out of His own created cosmos; to sweep away all the convictions of men in regard to His personality and His glorious attributes; to deprive man of what gives all its real value to life, the consciousness of immortality; to resolve his intellect and will into the action of molecular particles of matter, and to make of man himself a mere clod of earth. The attempt is as unscientific, as it is impious.

We have no controversy with the inductive method, when it confines itself to the investigation of physical facts; but, when it attempts to obtrude itself into the sphere of philosophy and theology, and to thrust its inductions, its theoretical inverted frustra of pyramids, always wider at the top than at the base, into the places occupied by truths, determined long ages ago by philosophy, or made known by divine revelation, we treat it as an intruder. Certain modern scientists, or sciolists, complain of this as presumption; but the presumption is all on their own side.

There is not, cannot be, any real antagonism between the final results of physical science and the defined dogmas of revealed religion; but the meaning of divine revelation as regards the origin of matter and of man is substantially determined, whilst the utterances of the physical sciences have not yet, by any means, been fully and clearly interpreted. Investigators of the material universe have not even found the keys—much less learned how to use them—to unlock the closed doors, which now prevent entrance into many of Nature's apartments; and they are utterly ignorant of what treasures of knowledge may there be stored up. When they shall have observed and studied *all* of Nature's facts, and shall have come to an agreement among themselves, both as to the facts and their relations, it will be time enough for them to invade the sphere of the spiritual and supernatural, and to begin to dogmatize about religion. And when they do this, they must change their method of thought, and adopt that of pure science, i. e., philosophy. And then, too, they will find that there are mysteries which even the profoundest philosophy cannot resolve, and which will ever remain inscrutable, except so far as divine revelation enables man to apprehend them.

The fact is, modern physicists totally misconceive the real nature of their functions, as investigators of material facts and phenomena. They seem to imagine that it belongs to them, by experiments in their laboratories and dissecting rooms, to work out questions of metaphysics and pure philosophy; and, going still higher, of religion. Just the opposite is the truth. Their mission as physicists is simply to gather and collate facts, which, when handed over to philosophers, become the raw materials which *they* must work up and determine the relations of, and their philosophical significance. Nor can even philosophers accomplish their work, unless they first obtain the key to the problems, with which they have to deal, from divine revelation. The natural world is mute and dumb, or, if heard speaking at all, its words are riddles, except when the existence of God, as the personal, absolute, self-existent, first cause and last end of all things, is taken as the key to understanding these, otherwise, incomprehensible utterances. That done, Nature has no longer a sphynx-like character, but becomes vocal with intelligible and harmonious praises of the wisdom and might and beneficence of the Creator of the heavens and the earth and all that is in them.

Modern scientists, not unfrequently, unconsciously testify to this. We find such unconscious, unintended testimony cropping out in Prof. Tyndall's writings. Speaking of "states of consciousness," he describes them as "mere symbols of an outside entity, which produces them and determines their order of succession, but the *real nature of which we can never know*." He then makes the following acknowledgment:

> "In fact the whole process of evolution is the manifestation of a power absolutely inscrutable to the intellect of man. As little in our day as in the days of Job, can man by searching find this power out. Considered fundamentally, it is by the operation of an *insoluble mystery* that life is evolved, species differentiated, and mind unfolded from their preponent elements in the immeasurable past."

Again, speaking of his own conception of a "cosmical life," etc., he says:

> "All we see around us, and all we feel within us, the phenomena of physical nature as well as those of the human mind, have their *unsearchable* roots in a cosmical life, if I dare apply the term, *an infinitesimal span of which only is offered to the investigation of man.* And even this span *is only knowable in part.* We can trace the development of a nervous system, and correlate with it the parallel phenomena of sensation and thought. We see with undoubting certainty that they go hand in hand. But we try to soar in a vacuum the moment *we seek to comprehend the connection between them. An Archimedean fulcrum is here required, which the human mind can not command, and the effort to solve the problem, to borrow an illustration from an illustrious friend of mine, is like the effort of a man trying to lift himself by his own waistband.*" * * *

Referring still to the connection between nervous action and the "parallel phenomena of sensation and thought," he affirms:

> "*There is no fusion possible between these two classes of facts—no motor energy in the intellect of man to carry it without logical rupture from the one to the other.*"

These utterances taken by themselves, and without regard to the general animus of the majority of modern physicists with whom Prof. Tyndall is in avowed sympathy, might well be construed into an acknowledgement of the imperfections and limitations of the methods employed by physical scientists. Prof. Tyndall makes his admissions in no such spirit. In the face of his own acknowledgment, that the field of physical investigation is hemmed in by metes and bounds, over which the human intellect unaided cannot leap, he yet tells us:

> "I prolong the vision backward across the boundary of the experimental evidence, and discern in......Matter......the promise and potency of every form and quality of life;"........"the human understanding.........is itself a result of the play between organism and environment through cosmic ranges of time;"......"so too is the feeling of awe, reverence, wonder—and not alone sexual love ....but the love of the beautiful, physical, and moral, in nature, poetry and art;" and "also *that deep-set feeling which, since the earliest dawn of history, and probably for ages prior to all history, incorporated itself in the religions of the world.*"

Can anything be more astounding than this declaration of Prof. Tyndall, in the face of his own previous acknowledgments of the impossibility of arriving at any certain conclusions on these subjects, by the processes of physical investigation, and his still further confession that the mysteries they involve are irresolvable by the human intellect?

This brings us to another point to which we direct attention. We refer to the assumption, which runs through Prof. Tyndall's whole address, (and in this he is a fair type and example of most modern scientists,) that because there *are* problems in the life of man, and the existence and action of matter, and of mind, irresolvable by the human understanding from the stand-point of the merely natural, there is, therefore, no higher stand-point from which, and no higher faculty impartible to man by which these problems can be comprehended. In other words, Prof. Tyndall ignores not only the existence of the supernatural, but all possibility of its existence. In like manner, he ignores the possibility of man by faith comprehending, what is incomprehensible by his natural understanding. But, in this, Prof. Tyndall proves himself an illogical reasoner. For, to use his own simile, the fact, that a man cannot lift himself by his waistband, does not prove that another cannot lift him; and so the fact, that man, in the exercise of his natural understanding, is not able to resolve the problems referred to, does not prove that he cannot comprehend them, when divinely aided and taught.

It might be reasonably supposed that in this theory there was no room for religion. Prof. Tyndall, however, makes room for it, and finds an "immovable basis" for it "in the religious sentiment, in the emotional part of man." Nor should it, he generously declares, be "derided by scientists" who have "escaped" from it "into the high and dry light of the understanding." "To yield this sentiment reasonable satisfaction, is the problem of problems at the present hour."

All this sounds to us like sarcasm, though we know that Prof. Tyndall does not intend it to be so construed. Yet, how he can talk seriously about an "immovable basis of the religious sentiment," when he makes that "sentiment" to be nothing more, than "a result of the play between organism and environment," is more than we are able to comprehend. In this he shuts out the very possibility of God being the object and final end of "religious sentiment," and makes that "sentiment" a purposeless, objectless feeling, a mere delusion, a phantom more unreal than the lakes and mountains and palaces, which fancy shapes out of the clouds painted by the setting sun. To this "sentiment" "reasonable satisfaction" should be "rendered." But this is nothing more than might be said respecting the physical feeling of hunger, or the sentiment of human friendship; both of which have definite objects, while religion has none, that we can discover. Nor has religion a right to determine for itself what this "reasonable satisfaction" should be. That is a problem whose solution belongs to those who stand entirely outside of "all religions," and above them; who, to repeat Prof. Tyndall's words, "have *escaped* from them into the high and dry light of the understanding." Here is a still further utterance on the same subject:

> "Grotesque in relation to scientific culture, as many of the religions of the world have been, and are—dangerous, nay destructive, to the dearest privileges of freemen, as some of them undoubtedly have been, and would, if they could be again—it will be wise to recognize them as the forms of a force, mischievous, if permitted to intrude on the region of knowledge, over which it holds no sway, but capable of being guided by liberal thought to noble issues in the region of emotion, which is its proper sphere."

Mr. Tyndall has felt greatly hurt by what he considers unfair inferences in regard to his posture towards Christianity. He has been called an "Atheist," and he protests that he is not. We do not regard him as an Atheist, using the word to designate one who positively denies the existence of God. Mr. Tyndall neither denies nor affirms it. He simply ignores it. To use St. Paul's language, he does not like to have God in his knowledge. What his ideas are of religion, and of the sphere it may occupy, have already, to some extent, been made apparent, we think, by the quotations already given from his Belfast address. The following however is apropos, and will perhaps help to a still clearer understanding, it not of his ideas, at least of their vagueness and contrariety.

> "I would set forth equally the inexorable advance of man's understanding, and the unquenchable claims of his emotional nature, which the understanding can never satisfy. The world embraces not only a Newton, but a Shakespeare—not only a Boyle, but a Raphael—not only a Kant, but a Beethooven—not only a Darwin, but a Carlyle. Not in each of these, but in all is human nature whole. They are not opposed, but supplementary; not mutually exclusive, but reconcilable. And if, still, the unsatisfied human mind, with the yearning of a pilgrim for his distant home, will turn to the mystery from which it has emerged, seeking so to fashion it, as to give unity to thought and faith, so long as this is done not only without intolerance or bigotry of any kind, but with the enlightened conviction that fixity of conception is unattainable, and that each succeeding age must be held free to fashion the mystery in accordance with its own needs—then, in opposition to all the restrictions of materialism, I would affirm this to be a field for the noblest exercise of what, in contrast with the knowing faculties, may be called the creative faculties of man."

Here, under a rhetorical show of liberality towards religion, everything is really taken away from it. The "knowing faculties" 'have nothing to do with it! "Fixity of conception is unattainable!" We acknowledge ourselves utterly unable, too, to understand how that which has no intellectual basis, and lies entirely outside of the "knowing faculties" of man, can, by any stretch of generosity, be regarded as a field for the noblest exercise of even our lowest faculties, much less of our "creative faculties."

We pass, with a bare mention, Prof. Tyndall's selection of representatives of religion—Raphael, Shakespeare, Beethoven and *Carlyle.*

We are surprised that he did not finish his inverted climax with Voltaire and Tom Paine. We pass this by, however, and direct attention to another point.

The "creations" of Raphael and Shakespeare live only because of the objective truth, which they embody and express. It is that, and that only, which gives them their force and beauty, their power to command admiration,—their immortality. Without that, they would have passed long ago from the thoughts and memory of men; without that, indeed, they could not have been produced. So, too, it is with Carlyle's "heroes," and his travesties of history. Underneath all their wild and wicked imaginings there is a certain amount of truth, which constitutes the basis on which they rest, and gives them whatever of strength and vitality they have.

But religion, according to Prof. Tyndall, has nothing whatever to rest upon. For the "immovable basis," which he assigns to it, is a sentiment without an object or an end—a mere phantom. The "religious sentiment," then, instead of being one which should have "reasonable satisfaction," should be sternly repressed, stamped out of existence, as a something, which in some unaccountable way has become a part of man's nature, but which perpetually interferes with the free activity of his "knowing faculties," and continually deludes him into holding as realities, what are most unreal illusions.

Analyzing Prof. Tyndall's rhetorical references to religion, as closely as such vague generalities can be, we make the following deductions:

1. Religion is purely a creation of the human imagination.
2. Religion has no objective basis of truth.
3 "Fixity" and certainty of religious belief are unattainable.
4. There are no supernatural truths cognizable by man.
5. Those who discard religion, or in other words, "escape" from it "into the high and dry light of the understanding," are the true philosophers.

It is not at all our purpose to attempt a refutation of the address of Profs. Tyndall and Huxley; but simply to bring out, as plainly as we can, their real posture towards Christianity. There is need that this be done; for, of late, quite an effort has been made to create the impression, that, as regards this, these gentlemen have been greatly misunderstood and misrepresented. We shall have occasion to refer again to Prof. Tyndall; we now turn to Prof. Huxley. His position can be very easily determined from his address at Belfast. He announces:

1. "That we have really no knowledge of external things, and that the only thing which is certain is, that they cannot be like what we imagine them to be; that the only certain knowledge we have of that efficient cause is, that it is in no sense like the picture we present to our consciousness."

2. That "as regards animals, the only view which can be scientifically adopted" is that, "although they are sensitive, and although they are conscious, yet they do act mechanically, and their different states of consciousness, their sensations, their thoughts (if they have any), their volitions (if they have them), are the products and consequences of their mechanical arrangements."

3. "Undoubtedly, I do hold that the view I have taken of the relations between the physical and mental faculties of brutes applies in its fullness and entirety to man; and if it was true that the logical consequences of that belief must land me in all these terrible things (Fatalism, Materialism, Atheism), I should not hesitate in allowing myself so to be landed. I should conceive that if I refused, I should have done the greatest and most abominable violence to everything, which is deepest in my moral nature."

Thus positively and dogmatically Prof. Huxley states his theory and backs it up by the assertion, that it is the only one, which can be scientifically adopted; and yet, in a previous part of his address, he says—referring to consciousness, its origin and its relation to the physical structure of animals and men—"I am afraid that the matter is wholly incapable of demonstrative proof."

The logical consequences, which Prof. Huxley lightly brushes aside, are obvious. They do involve Fatalism and Atheism. They imply, if not a positive denial of God's existence, at least a denial, that any evidences of His existence are to be found in the natural world. They brush entirely away all ideas of a Divine Providence, all-wise, all-powerful, free to will, and to act, in the world which He has created, preserves and rules over. They involve a denial of all certainty of knowledge of external things, and they sweep away entirely the belief of the Christian world in regard to the origin of matter, and of mind, and of evil; they deny in fact the existence of evil, and of moral responsibility. They go further still. They rule out of existence, except as mere delusions, not only all religious truths and theological dogmas, but also the whole system of criminal jurisprudence; and would—if they could be reduced to a practical shape—uproot, from its lowest foundations, the entire structure of society. A prisoner, brought before a criminal court, might consistently plead that he did commit the act charged against him, but that it was simply an act of unconscious cerebration. A murderer might plead that the fatal blow was only the muscular motion of his arm produced by involuntary nervous action. Prof. Huxley's declaration, that he would do "the greatest and most abominable violence" to his "moral nature," if he "refused," from regard for their "logical consequences," to hold the views he enounced, seems to us senseless. For, conceding the possibility of the existence of such a thing as a moral nature in man, it is impossible to conceive what claim or authority it can have, or how violence can be done to it, if man's thoughts and volitions are nothing more than the products and consequences of the mechanical arrangements of the particles of matter, which enter into his body or his brains.

We turn now to Prof. Tyndall's latest publication, "Martineau and Materialism." It is the preface to the forthcoming edition of "Fragments of Science," and is designed to be a refutation of the charge brought against him of irreligion and materialism, and also a counter indictment, for narrow-mindedness and bigotry, of all who maintain the claims of divine revelation upon human credence.

The first thing, that strikes a reader of this beautifully written but sophistical production, is the tone of lofty contempt for all who dare to attach the slightest importance to the statements of Sacred Scripture. "The Mosaic picture of the genetic order of things has been not only altered but inverted by scientific research." "Notwithstanding the deplorable condition to which the picture has been reduced, it is exhibited fresh every week to millions taught to believe it as divine." These are not Prof. Tyndall's words, but he quotes them with full approval. With this is coupled an encomium upon the infidel Anglican "Bishop of Natal," who, "for openly avowing doubts, which, it is said, others discreetly entertain, suffered persecution" for "his public fidelity to scientific truth." Nor is there wanting a seasonable word of advice to sensible Christians, and of rebuke to "ultramontane" Catholics.

> "The liberal and enlightened portion of Christendom must, I take it, differentiate itself more and more, in word and act, from the fanatical, foolish and more sacerdotal portion. Enlightened Roman Catholics are more specially bound to take action here; for the travesty of heaven and earth is grosser, and the attempt to impose it on the world is more serious, in their community than elsewhere......Their spiritual guides live so exclusively in the pre-scientific past, that even the really strong intellects among them are reduced to atrophy as regards scientific truth. Eyes they have, and see not; ears they have, and hear not; for both eyes and ears are taken possession of by the sights and sounds of another age. In relation to science, the ultramontane brain, through lack of exercise, is virtually the undeveloped brain of the child. And thus it is, that as children in scientific knowledge, but potent wielders of spiritual power among the ignorant, they bring the blush of shame to the cheeks of the more intelligent among themselves."

Along with this is an utterance in regard to education, by which those Catholics may profit, who delude themselves with the notion that their children may safely receive from skeptics or non-Catholics instruction in the physical sciences.

> "Such is the force of early education, when maintained and perpetuated by the habits of subsequent life; such the ground of peril in allowing the schools of a nation to fall into ultramontane hands. Let any able Catholic student, fairly educated, and not yet cramped by sacerdotalism, get a real scientific grasp of the magnitude and organization of this universe;.........let him bring the thoughts and conceptions which thus enter his mind face to face with the notions of the genesis and rule of things which pervade the writings of the princes of his Church, and he will see and feel what drivelers even men of strenuous intellect may become, through exclusively dwelling and dealing with theological chimeras."

Prof. Tyndall reiterates his declaration that he does not utterly repudiate religion; but his idea of religion is a mere vague feeling of wonder and awe in the presence of impenetrable mysteries, not a whit more rational, than the feelings of a savage on first seeing a locomotive.

> "Breaking contact with the hampering details of earth, this feeling associates man with a power, which gives fullness and tone to his existence, but which he can neither analyze nor comprehend;"......"but when I attempt to give the power which I see manifested in the universe an objective form, personal or otherwise, it slips away from me, declining all intelligent manipulation. I dare not, save poetically, use the pronoun 'he' regarding it; I dare not call it a 'mind;' I refuse to call it even a 'cause.' Its mystery overshadows me; but it remains a mystery, while the objective frames which my neighbors try to make it fit, simply distort and desecrate it."

This "mystery" he reiterates is entirely unknowable; it exists, but it is inscrutable; it stands entirely outside the sphere of human thought; it has no medium or means of revealing itself to the human intellect, no attributes, no reason or purpose, no end; respecting it man cannot "profess to *know*" anything; all he can claim is "I *feel*."

It is unnecessary to point out the fallacy of these utterances. Because no microscope or telescope can make this power visible, because no scalpel can dissect it, nor any inductions of physical science demonstrate it, Prof. Tyndall rules it out of the sphere of thought, and concludes that it cannot be known. The conclusion does not follow from the premises; it is a pure assumption, which logic does not require the Christian to disprove. The burden of proof rests upon Prof. Tyndall; the responsibility of which, however, he does not make the slightest attempt to meet. He contents himself with saying that he knows nothing about it. He declares that he is not a materialist; but the reason he gives is one which has no force. "Were not man's origin implicated," he says, "we should accept without a murmur the derivation of animal and vegetable life from what we call inorganic nature. The conclusion of pure intellect points this way."

Professor Tyndall is not a materialist in the popular, ordinary acceptation of the word; not because he allows room in his theory for the action of the divine will, but because his conception of matter differs from that which commonly prevails. Tracing the growth of a human being in the womb from the ovum to the babe "appearing in due time a living miracle with all its organs and all their implications," he holds, that all that the human being is and can become—its mind and will, its thoughts and volitions—"comes from an egg" which he "holds to be matter," and only matter, "as much as the seed of a fern or of an oak;" and he recognizes no power outside the matter of the fern seed, and the acorn, and the egg, and antecedent to them, in virtue of which they become respectively the fern, the oak, and the self-conscious, intelligent human being. "Matter," he says, "I define as that mysterious thing by which all this is accomplished. At the question "how did matter come to have this power?" he abruptly stops, with the declaration, "on this I never ventured an opinion."

But just here is one of the evasions, of which modern physicists are constantly guilty. They have no right thus to stop short. When they deny, or ignore, the existence of God and His creative will, and undertake to explain the existence and action of matter, of the mind and the will; when they scout and scorn the statements of divine revelation; when they deny the very possibility of a divine revelation having been made, and scoff at the men, who believe in it, as "drivellers," they cannot dismiss the question with the reply: "On that we never ventured an opinion." It meets them as a challenge which they cannot evade, except at the alternative of being classed with braggarts, who scoff at their antagonists at a distance, but fly from the field of battle, when the issue is made up and the onset sounded. If God is not the Creator of matter, however you define it, the Author and Bestower of all its potencies and powers, the First Cause of all its motions and operations, of every form it assumes throughout the universe, how comes matter to exist at all, and how comes it to have any "powers or potencies?" Until physical scientists are prepared to answer these questions, they are bound to confine themselves simply to the facts, to which their empirical processes are applicable, and to leave untouched, as outside their field of investigation, the questions of origin and creation, of human consciousness, and of human responsibility, which they boast they will "wrest" from theology. Their confessions that these questions are "inscrutable" by their processes, and "unthinkable" according to their manner of thought, only prove that they have forgotten the maxim: "*Ne sutor ultra crepidam.*"

As enforcing and still farther illustrating what we have said, we here quote from a letter of Parke Godwin's, in reply to an adverse criticism of his views by Mr. Yeomans, editor of the Popular Science Monthly:

> There are "two capital distinctions which it is always important to keep in view, when estimating the scientific validity of a doctrine. The first is that many questions determinable by science are not yet determined by it; and until they are so determined, are to be regarded only as conjectural opinions, more or less pertinent or impertinent........ They are suppositions to which the mind resorts to help it in the reduction of certain appearances of Nature to a general law; and, as such, they may be simple, ingenious, and even beautiful; but thus far they are no more than suppositions not proved, and therefore not entitled to the authority of scientific truth.
>
> "You are probably too familiar with the history of scientific effort—which, like the history of many other kinds of intellectual effort, is a history of human error—not to know, that while hypothesis is an indispensable part of good method, it is also the part most liable to error. The records of astronomical, of geological, of physical, of chemical, and of biological research, are strewn with the *debris* of abandoned systems, all of which once had their vogue, but none of which now survive, and many of which are hardly remembered. Recall, for a moment, the Ptolemaic cycles and epicycles; recall Kepler's nineteen different hypotheses, invented and discarded before he

found the true orbital motion of Mars; recall in geology Werner and Hutton, and the Plutonians and the Neptunians, superseded by the Uniformitarians and the Catastrophists, and now giving way to the Evolutionists; recall in physics the many imponderable fluids, including Lamarck's resonant fluid, that were held as real as the rocks only a few years ago; recall in chemistry, not to mention the alchemists and phlogiston, a dozen different modes of accounting for molecular action; recall in biology the animists and the vitalists, the devotees of plastic forces, of archei, of organizing ideas, and of central monads, all of them now deemed purely gratuitous assumptions, that explained nothing, though put forth as science.

........."Indeed, nothing is more easy than to make theories; but the difficulty is to get them adopted into Nature as the satisfactory reason of her processes. But, until they are so adopted, they are nothing more than the scaffolding of science—by no means the completed structure. Now, have the Darwinian and the Spencerian hypotheses been so adopted? Can we say that any questions on which such cautious observers and life-long students as Darwin, Owen, Huxley, Wallace and Agassiz still debate, are settled questions?...... With what propriety then can a merely provisional conclusion be erected into an assured standpoint, whence to assail traditionary beliefs as if they were old wives' fables?

"More than that, a theory may be far more advanced than any of those; may be able to account satisfactorily for all the phenomena within its reach, as the Ptolemaic theory of the sidereal appearances did, even to the prediction of eclipses, or as the emanation theory of Dr. Young, and yet turn out altogether baseless. Nature is a prodigious quantity and a prodigious force; with all her outward uniformities, she is often more cunning than the Sphynx; and, like Emerson's Brahma, she may declare to her students:

'They know not well the subtle ways
I keep, and pass and turn again.'

"We have looked into her face a little, measured some of her ellipses and angles, weighed her gases and dusts, and unveiled certain forces far and near—all of which are glorious things to have done, and some of them seemingly miraculous: but we are still only in her outer courts. Humboldt's 'Cosmos,' written thirty years ago, is said to be already an antiquated book; and Compte, who died but lately......could hardly pass a college examination in the sciences he was supposed to have classified forever. Let us not be too confident, then, that our little systems of natural law will not, like other systems of thought spoken of by Tennyson, 'have their day.'

"The other distinction I had in my mind......was that, while there are some problems accessible to scientific methods, there are others that are not; and that any proffered scientific solution of the latter, either negative or affirmative, is most likely an imposition. What I meant was that science, according to its own confessions, that is, according to the teachings of its most accredited organs, pretends to no other function than to the ascertainment of the actual phenomena of Nature, and of their constant relations. The sphere of the finite and the relative, i. e., of existence, not of essence, and of existence in its mutual and manifested dependencies in time and space, circumscribes and exhausts its jurisdiction......... Does science assert for itself higher and broader pretensions? Does it propose to penetrate the supernatural or metaphysical realms?..........Does it intend to apply its instruments to the measurement of the infinite, and its crucibles to the decomposition of the absolute?

"You, as a man of excellent sense, will promptly answer, No! But then, I ask, is thought, whose expatiations are so restless and irrepressible, to be forever shut up to the phenomenal and relative? Is it to be forever stifled under a bushel measure, or tied by the legs with a surveyor's chain?........ In other words, I contend—and here I hit upon the prime fallacy of many *soi disant* scientists—that science has no right to erect *what it does contain into a negation of everything which it does not contain.* Still less has it a right to decide questions out of its confessed province, because it cannot reach them by its peculiar methods, or subject them to its peculiar tests."

It is not necessary, therefore, for the Christian philosopher to follow skeptical physicists, step by step, in their investigation, and point out, one by one, the mistakes in their experiments. From the standpoint of physical science and by the inductive method, it is as wild for them to undertake to comprehend the supernatural and the infinite, as it was for the Titans of heathen mythology to attempt to climb into Heaven by piling Pelion upon Ossa. No chain which physicists can forge, nor sounding line which they can twist, will suffice to measure the heights or fathom the depths of Infinitude. Moreover, when they pass beyond the field of investigation of the phenomena of nature, and turn their thoughts to their first origin and cause, they must perforce leave behind them their scalpels and microscopes, their chemical reagents, and weights, and measures, and, with them, their inductive method; and they must build their ratiocinations upon premises, which presuppose and necessitate assent to what most of them deny.

They can no more escape from this, than the mathematician can escape from the axioms of mathematics. For the relative and the finite require the absolute and the infinite as a necessity for their own existence.

Thus nature, vast and powerful as she is, declares her own limitation and dependence, and consequently the existence of a Divine Creator. Nor does nature's own harmony allow a doubt, but that, when her utterances are more truthfully interpreted in detail, they will all be found entirely to accord with this general testimony. No fact of the material world, when its limitations and relations come to be fully understood, will fail to fit into its proper place in the Cosmos of the Universe; nor will its voice be at all discordant in the grand anthem of praise, which goes up unceasingly from the heavens and the earth, in honor of Him who created them.

Yet, though this is so, it is the duty of Christian controversialists to enter the provinces over which skeptical scientists usurp dominion, to point out their mistakes, and thus re-conquer, for truth and for God, the territories in which these scientists claim supremacy.

In this work Father Thebaud has engaged, in the book the title of which we have placed at the head of this article. It evinces extensive and laborious research and close thought; and is a valuable addition to modern Christian apologetic literature. It is fully up with the times.

The latest results of archæological, ethnological, philological and historical study are carefully analyzed and digested, and made to pour a flood of light upon the actual condition of man in the earliest times, as regards civilization and religion. The treatment of the subject, throughout, is vigorous and scholarly; adverse theories and objections are candidly and fairly stated and confuted; authorities are numerously cited. The work is philosophical, rather than polemical, and will be read, with profit and pleasure, alike by those who wish to acquaint themselves with the subject merely as a matter of archæological interest, and by Catholics and Protestants who desire to study it in its relation to Christianity.

It was our purpose, at the outset, to give a very full synopsis of the book; but this is not possible in the space yet left us. The most that we shall attempt to do is to state some few points in the first part of the argument. The work is mainly devoted to the proof and elucidation of two propositions, either of which, when established, entirely upsets the Darwinian and Spencerian theories of the origin of man. These propositions are:

First, that man was not evolved from a lower form of existence into that of humanity.

Second, that man's original condition was not that of a brutal savage, from which, by a long process of self-evolution and without divine assistance, he has been developed into what he now is; but that his original condition was that of an intellectual, civilized being.

The first of these propositions Father Thebaud touches upon only incidentally, and only in the introductory chapter of his work, devoting himself in the body of it to the proof and elucidation of the second proposition. The establishment of this, however, compels the admission of the other. For if man's condition at the earliest period of which we have any evidence of his existence, was not that of a savage, but one high up in the scale of knowledge and intellectual power, morality and religion, from which he subsequently descended rather than ascended, the fact shows a fatal gap in the chain of inferences on which the evolution theory depends. For one of the links of this chain—and one without which continuity is impossible—is that man started *as* MAN in the lowest condition of savage life, but one remove from the brute. That assumption disproved, the whole theory falls to the ground.

Father Thebaud discusses his subject not from a biological, but from a historical stand-point. His reasons for this, and also the general plan of his book, are well set forth in the preface. He says:

> ...."The historical treatment of the subject ought not to be discarded. It ought, on the contrary, to be more insisted on than ever; for human history cannot contradict natural science, and what it obliges us to accept, has to be accepted. It is true the gentlemen who give to man a really fabulous antiquity, altogether unacceptable to Christians, imagine they can place themselves in a position of safety with respect to the direct testimony of history, by the assertion, that man could have no annals nor monuments, when he was yet unconscious. For, in their opinion, the natural passage of man from the original "protoplasm" to the state of a well-developed "ape" must have required millions of years of complete unconsciousness; and how many ages more must have been necessary for a "Simian anthropoid" to acquire the art of sharpening flint into an arrow, and a stick of hard wood into a club, not to mention the farther, greater progress, supposed by the invention of a covering of

leaves for their nudity? During all this time, of course, the ancestors of man were unconscious. And, finally, the commencement of records, rude at first and of the simplest kind—first proof of real consciousness—supposes another long series of years..........

"This, of course, supposes that the whole system of evolution has been proved without fear of contradiction. This will scarcely be maintained by even the most fervent 'scientists.' And, what is more, we will venture to assert that such a demonstration never will be forthcoming. But we will not insist on this. Our purport is very different—we say: We assert, that if things had taken place as the evolutionists assure us they have, the first records of mankind would be those of rude people just emerging from barbarism. In point of art and culture, in point of ideas and language, chiefly in point of religion, we should find in their social state the most rude elements of a "childish" and "growing" soul; we should be able to trace the steps by which, from the first notions of a coarse religious system, they would have arrived at the point of *inventing God and all His attributes.* This would have been, in the sense of evolutionists a mere subjective theory, perfectly independent of any objective Divine Essence, and having nothing in common with the certain belief that the reason of man can know God, and demonstrate to man His existence. They assert it has been so, and that historical man began everywhere by being a barbarian. Here we join issue with them, and one of the great purports of this volume will be to establish solidly the fact, that man appeared first in a state of civilization, possessed of noble ideas as to his own origin, the Creator, One Supreme God, ruling the universe; etc. We intend to prove historically that he invented none of the great religious and moral truths by the process mentioned above; but that these came to him from heaven. We will endeavor to show the first men everywhere monotheists, generally pure in their morals, dignified in their bearing, and cultivated in their intellect. Should this be well and firmly established, the whole monstrous system of man's evolution falls to the ground. Still more will this be the case if it be proved, besides, that the supposed "continuous progress," which is the mainstay of their theory, is a dream, a non-entity, that, on the contrary, man only progressed in the wrong direction, going from monotheism to pantheism, from this to idolatry, and from this to "individualism' in religion; that this seems to be the law which has governed mankind until the Redeemer came to bring back man to truth, and to found at last a true and strict religious society, not confined to one nation like Judaism, but universal.

"Progress is a fine and catching word, but its greatest admirers are themselves bound to confess that, historically, it has been distinguished by many an overthrow; the edifice in process of construction has often crumbled into ruins, and the savage Goth has spurned with his foot the graciously-moulded Grecian statue, the last and perfect expression of art. No sensible man can admit a continuous progress in history. Yet it is of the nature of evolution to be 'continuous,' since history cannot contradict natural science. If evolution is once interrupted it ceases entirely to be, and must start afresh. But we intend to go much farther than this, and to prove our previous assertion: that nations, after having reached a certain point, always 'progress backward,' and lose gradually the steps in advance they had made. This at least seems to be the historical law for the times anterior to Christianity."

Father Thebaud's idea of the relation of revelation to physical science may be gathered from the following:

.... "We assert that the revealed word of God was not certainly given to teach us science; but not a single phrase of it, rightly understood, can be opposed to true science, and that there is much in it which has anticipated science.................. Whatever may have been the individual thoughts of the true prophets of God, whatever else they may have personally attached to the words they uttered, the words themselves had a deep meaning, intended surely by the Divine Revealer to illumine the future discoverers of his laws, and to show them that whatever they might discover He had created."

The discussion of the references in Genesis, in Job, and in the Psalms to the origin of the universe, the creation of light, the formation and condensation of vapor, etc., and to metereological processes, evinces extensive knowledge and study of natural phenomena, as well as of sacred scripture, on the part of Father Thebaud, and is expressed in language of great beauty and force. The conclusion arrived at is, that "the more science advances, the more the accuracy, even of expression, of these scientific hintings of Holy Scripture, shows that, often at least, the words themselves could not have come but from the lips of God." We commend a careful reading of this part of Father Thebaud's book to those who, like Prof. Proctor, think that the account of creation in Genesis is simply allegorical, written to suit the ideas of men who were in a "puerile" state of mind.

The discussion of the configuration of the earth, designed for one race of men, existing in numerous nationalities, but preserving a unity of sentiments, ideas and of religion, we must pass by, and also the discussion of the process of the disintegration and dispersion of mankind. On this latter point much light has been thrown, through discoveries recently made by the excavation of ancient ruins in Persia, and by the progress of ethnology and comparative philology. The results of these, Father Thebaud has condensed with great skill and clearness of method. The conclusions which he reaches at the close of his introductory chapter, and which the body of his work is designed to prove, he states as follows:

> "The end, therefore, God had in view in prescribing to the earth its configuration, and in giving to mankind one progenitor, first in Adam, and then in Noah, was kept in abeyance; and instead of unity, division came to be the great feature of the globe itself and of the human family. The ocean..............intended...............for a universal element of intercommunication, became an impassable abyss over which men cast their shuddering eyes, when they looked out upon its shores. The rivers, and the mountains from which they gushed forth, instead of being highways and public roads, were turned into barriers of division, behind which the timorous and hostile tribes looked askance at each other, and thought only of overreaching their neighbors changed into enemies. That "articulate speech," so celebrated in Homer as the great characteristic of God-like man, and by which he is raised so high above the lower animals, the mind's medium of exchange, the instrument of sweet intercourse, the great bond of unity, whilst remaining in itself one, was split into thousands of idioms, every one unintelligible to those who spoke any one of the rest; and thus reduced every insignificant tribe to the sad condition of looking on all mankind out of their own small community as if it was really deprived of speech, and composed of deaf and dumb animals. Religion, finally, the worship of a common Creator, deprived of authoritative teaching and of a central light, became the greatest source of division, and would of itself have made of earth a real hell, inflamed incessantly by the burning fire of fanatical hatred and war."

These statements Father Thebaud confirms in the body of his work by a complete, thorough digest of the results of archæological studies. The manners, customs, and political condition of the most ancient peoples of Greece, Egypt, India, and Central Asia, and their religious ideas and practices, are all brought under review, and submitted to the most searching analysis, the result of which fully substantiates the statements made above.

Before entering, however, upon this work, Father Thebaud clears the way for a successful treatment of his main subject, by discussing succinctly a previous question, namely, the supposed primitive barbarism of the human race.

For, as he pertinently says, when it is established that nothing has been really proved by the numerous geological and archæological discoveries, made lately in Western Europe, in opposition to the comparatively modern origin of our species, " then it will be clearly understood that history and tradition have not lost any of their real value, and that we can listen to their voices without fear of being deceived by them."

Father Thebaud discards the consideration of the zoological question with regard to the origin of man; and wisely. For with the diversities and contrarieties of opinion among modern physicists, both as to the facts from which they argue, and the inferences fairly deducible from those facts, and their repeated admissions, that both the phenomena of physical nature and those of the human mind have their " unsearchable roots" in a cosmos of which only "an infinitesimal span is offered to the investigation" of man, and that this infinitesimal span is only "knowable in part," their speculations may be summarily dismissed as having no substantial basis. Besides, geological investigation furnishes negative proof against them.

"For," says Father Thebaud, "if man had really been evolved from the brute by an indefinitely long process of a succession of specific changes—the product of natural selection—geology would have proved it long ago." " The forms of a great number of extinct species are forever preserved in a fossil state. The specific characteristics of all these formerly organized and living beings are so precise that naturalists introduce them in their classifications." "But you search in vain among them for a single fossil, which shows that it was in an incipient stage with respect to any of its future organs. Not one of the innumerable organisms, which according to the Darwinian theory must have existed 'prior to their ultimately reaching the well-defined characters of species now known to us' has been found among the remains embalmed in the 'universal place of sepulchre for all former beings—the rocks and drift deposits of former ages.' And this is true, not only of the Darwinian 'ancestors' of man, but of all classes of animals, of whatever kind they may be supposed to have been."

The so-called " Stone-period" is one of the points most strenuously insisted upon by the supporters of the theory that man's first condition *as* MAN was that of a brutal savage. The following statement of the facts, most strongly relied upon in connection with this theory, is made by Father Thebaud:

" On both banks of nearly all the rivers of Western Europe, often at a distance from the shores, are seen ranges of hills, running parallel with the streams. If these topographical elevations are looked into closely, deposits of coarse gravel below, and sand above, generally are found, varying in depth, but descending mostly to a depth of from ten to twenty feet. These strata are always—sometimes as high as one hundred feet, often less—above the actual bed of the river. Over the whole a coating of argillaceous clay is spread. In many localities in England, France, and other European countries, two kinds of heterogeneous substances are found embedded in the gravel, the sand, or even the clay. First, pieces of flint—never anything else—worked, or rather clipped unartistically, in the rough shape of pointed cones, rounded clubs, or flattened spears, arrows, awls, &c., never to be inserted in handles of any kind; and secondly, often together with these, the undoubted remains of huge animals, some of them of extinct species, others of actually existing kinds, but living in countries farther north or south, together with extinct species of plants.

"These deposits are generally met with *on both sides of the rivers, mostly at a distance from them;* and it looks really as if the whole intermediate distance across, in the entire length of the stream, had been originally filled with the same deposits, which must have been swept away to the sea, or into caves often discovered in the neighborhood choke-full of the same objects. When this occurs near the mouth of rivers, the great distance between both ranges of hills, the depth looked down into from the tops of surrounding heights, strikes the beholder with awe, when he knows that such an enormous quantity of material has been swept away by the current and buried at the bottom of the ocean. It is useless to add that the insignificant bed of the actual stream adds to the effect produced on the imagination by the conception of the past. These few words, we think, have placed the difficulty before us in all its strength. We are now in possession of the leading facts. Our limits will not admit of our going into any minuter detail."

The most strenuous upholders of the "primitive barbarism" theory must admit the candor and fairness of this statement. Any explanation which shows, that the facts, it recites, are not inconsistent with the denial of the universal barbarism of mankind, when these stone implements were made and used, will be an equally satisfactory explanation of the "bone-caves" and "lacustrine" remains.

The answer of Father Thebaud is clear, and to our mind entirely conclusive. He analyzes, arranges and discusses the facts, with great ability and much candor; points out clearly their bearings and relations; cites the opinions of the most learned savans respecting them and their collateral facts; shows the absent links in the chain of inferences of the evolution theorists; directs attention to other facts, which are entirely left out of view by these theorists; and supports his own conclusions by arguments from admitted geological, metereological and archæological data. Those, who desire to read a discussion of this subject of a "stone-period," at once lucid, candid and in the interests of Christianity, will find it in Father Thebaud's book.

We will attempt a synopsis of the argument, or rather a statement of its main points. We shall freely employ the language of Father Thebaud, but will not do him the injustice of placing quotation marks to the detached sentences and clauses, which, for the sake of condensation, we interweave with our own:

1. The advocates of the "primitive barbarism' theory assume, without proof, that these newly-found deposits are universal, or, at least, co extensive with the deposits which mark well-determined geological eras. Formerly they made in geological treatises a part of what was correctly called the Drift. And this was in accordance with

the facts. For no great portions of the globe are covered with this now celebrated coating of clay above an underlying of sand and gravel. It is found only along watercourses and is therefore a phenomenon of drift and nothing else. It comes evidently from floods, of the violence of which we now have scarcely any conception. Consequently the assumption that it must have required incalculable periods of time, to first form these deposits and then to excavate the intervening valleys, is entirelygratuitous and without foundation,

The term "drift," therefore, did not suit the "primitive barbarism" theorists. They accordingly invented a new geological era and a new name, terming these deposits the "Quaternary Deposit." The design of this is obvious. The well-known Primary, Secondary and Tertiary strata are nearly co-extensive with the earth itself; and the impression produced by this new term is that, contrary to the truth, the deposits referred to are equally extensive.

2. The remains of immense mammalia—elephants, bears and tigers, etc., the congeners of which in our days look like young cubs compared to those prototypes—astonished the beholder, and gave a stronger idea of the weakness, inferiority and rough life of "primitive-barbarian" man. But simple reason tells us that if the life of our first ancestors (all of them) had been such as is described, mankind would have disappeared long before the extinction of such fearful enemies.

3. The artistic difference between the rough palæolithic flints and the polished stones of the neolithic period exhibits a gap which tells but indifferently in favor of the believers in continuous progress. Either there has been a strange severance of continuity, or the men of the first period were better artists, and not such rough barbarians, as the remains we possess of them seem to attest. The supporters of primitive barbarism acknowledge the existence of this gap, and express the hope that the intervening links necessary to fill it up, may yet be discovered. But perhaps the expected discoveries may bring to light the fact that these men, besides their flint instruments, had others proving a higher intellectual status than has been accorded to them. The upholders, therefore, of the primitive barbarism theory, are in the position of persons who have jumped at conclusions, which the facts as yet known are not sufficient to sustain.

These coarse tools found, do not give the measure of the intellect of that portion of the human race which existed at that time, and in that locality. Many things have been lost, which might have given us a different idea of their intellect. They must have been far superior in intelligence to all those monsters, and they must have had other tools and weapons than any which have been unearthed, to oppose successfully such huge and ferocious enemies. Otherwise they would have perished before these animals became extinct. But the Darwinians themselves maintain that they did not; for if this had happened, according to their theory, we could not have descended, as they contend we have, but of which they can furnish no proof, from these primitive savage men. Thus this hypothesis contradicts itself.

4. In fact, recent discoveries prove that these "primitive" men of Europe not only worked on stone, but also on bone and ivory. We have in their remains not only rude hatchets and adzes, but implements adapted to domestic uses and personal ornaments, and spirited sketches in intaglio, in which the animals then existing are drawn with wonderful precision. And these sketches, some of them highly artistic and beautiful, must have been made in the palæolithic age, not in the neolithic; because, in the latter age, those animals had disappeared. The man of that period, then, in Europe, would not, after all, have been as barbarous as he is commonly represented.

5. Quite recent discoveries in Egypt and adjoining countries prove that they are literally filled with stone implements of the so-called palæolithic and neolithic ages, but all evidently belonging to the true historic period; to all centuries, in fact, from the first Egyptian dynasties to the Ptolemies. They are invariably mixed up, too, with copper, bronze, and even, sometimes, iron implements.

6. There are to-day men to whom the use of iron and bronze instruments is unknown, and but a few centuries ago there were extensive regions exclusively inhab-

ited by men in the lowest condition of savage life, while other regions were occupied by the refined peoples of Europe; and it is indisputable that these different conditions of mankind have existed from the earliest periods of which we have any historic knowledge. The assumption therefore is too violent, too contradictory to well ascertained facts, to merit acceptance, that because man was once in a state of barbarism in Europe, that that was then his condition everywhere, much less his primitive condition.

7. The type of the men whose remains have been found in the so-called quaternary deposit has been determined mainly by the labors of Dr. Pruner-Bey; and his conclusions have received the assent of many of the most eminent anatomists particularly of France. The study of the skeletons, that have been found, shows that the men of this "Stone period" were far superior to their pretended prototype, though much inferior to other races existing at the same time in other parts of the world. They belong plainly to that branch of the human family called Mongoloid by Dr. Pruner-Bey, Quatrefages and Max Müller (much more extensive than the former Mongolian race), called Allophyllon by Dr. Pritchard, Turanian by many other writers, and Hamitic by De Maistre, Lord Arundel, and others. Dr. Pruner-Bey (and many eminent savans have adopted his opinion,) thinks that in the skeletons in his possession he can recognize four principal races, which can be assimilated to four existing races at the present time, namely, the Lapps, the Finns, the Esthonians and the Esquimaux of Behring straits.

This is only a bare statement of some of the points in the argument. There are others, of minor weight of themselves, but important, as giving increased significance to those we have stated; which we are compelled to omit. In enforcing and illustrating these points, Father Thebaud makes copious use of the most recent discoveries and studies in paleontology and archæology, citing numerous authorities, and with great discrimination sifting and collating their statements and conclusions.

We had intended giving an exhibit of Father Thebaud's discussion of the facts brought to light by late archæological and philological investigations, which corroborate the Mosaic account of the dispersion of mankind at the erection of the tower of Babel; but we must omit it. Suffice it to say that he shows, by multitudinous proofs, beyond all possibility of contradiction, as it seems to us, that the statements of Scripture respecting the curse pronounced upon Ham in his descendants, and respecting the tower of Babel and the dispersion of the human race, must be accepted as genuine history. He traces the migrations of the Hamitic or Turanian or Mongoloid races; he shows that whilst the descendants of Shem and Japhet remained for a time in Central Asia, leading a simple but refined life, as is proved by the evidences of their civilization and their religion which have come down to us; that the Hamitic races were the first to migrate; that they rapidly degenerated into a savage condition; and that their descendants have remained generally stationary, or nearly so, until this day. These are not simply unsupported assertions. The sciences of philology, archæology, comparative anatomy, and ancient history, are all laid under contribution; and the results of the study of these subjects by the most eminent savans are freely and discriminatingly employed.

We have only touched upon the topics comprised in the first third or fourth of the book, in what may be called the preliminary discussion. This, of itself, would make an invaluable treatise. It is remarkably free from the mere technicalities of science; and is so well arranged as regards topics, and written in such clear and simple style, that any person of intelligence interested in the subjects which it treats, will read it with pleasure and profit.

In the body of his work Father Thebaud investigates the civilization, the literature and the religions of Central Asia, India, China, Egypt, Greece and Italy. He shows that men, at first, were not barbarians, but highly civilized; that they at first existed in a tribal condition; that monarchies were established afterwards, and that even under those monarchies the tribal condition still, in a great measure, continued; that there still remain evidences of the refinement, simplicity of life, and purity of morals and religion of primeval man; that the first religion was pure monotheism, from which men fell into pantheism, then into the worship of different powers and forms of the natural world, and then into grosser forms of idolatry; and that, with this religious decline, there was a corresponding decline in morality, and also ultimately in civilization. We may mention, as chapters of special interest, those in which the ancient literature of India and Persia are discussed, and that also in which the literature and religion of "Pelasgic Greece" and Heroic Greece, and the fundamental religious ideas of the Greek philosophy and of the Grecian and Latin poets, are subjected to a searching analysis.

This part of Father Thebaud's work is worthy of a separate article. We trust that some one, abler and more conversant with the topics treated on, will discuss this portion of the book, at some future time.

Our main object, in criticising the addresses of Professors Tyndall and Huxley, and in cursorily reviewing the introductory chapters of Father Thebaud's "Gentilism," has not been to refute the former nor to attempt to enforce the views of the latter; but, rather to exhibit the striking difference between them in regard to the certainty, and the character of the conclusions arrived at. If a reader of the addresses at Belfast asks himself, "to what end do all this glittering rhetoric and specious argumentation tend?" the only consistent answer, he can give, is, "to no certainty whatever: I know nothing, and cannot know anything, about the questions discussed; they are 'irresolvable,' 'inscrutable,' 'unthinkable,' 'unknowable,' according to the declarations of Professors Tyndall and Huxley." But, if that reader will then turn to Father Thebaud, and will give his book a thoughtful and unprejudiced perusal, he will rise from it with clear, definite knowledge, and rational, well-grounded conclusions. Nature will be to him no fortuitious concourse of atoms, whose origin is "unknowable;" no mute and dumb sphynx, but a real COSMOS, vocal with intelligible and accordant utterances. Even where their meaning may not be fully understood, they will be felt and known by him, who has the gift of faith, to be in perfect consistency with what has been already definitely determined. Man will not then be degraded to the plane of inorganic matter, but will appear, as he is, a being glorious in his endowments, destined to immortality, the head and crown, under God, of all creation; his high hopes and inextinguishable aspirations not illusions, but grounded on reality, and possible of fruition; and Christianity will be, not an accidental form of an emotion which has neither purpose, nor object, nor end, lying entirely outside of the sphere of human reason, but a revelation from God, opening up to man's intellectual vision, cleared and strengthened by faith, a glorious reality, such as "the eye hath not seen, nor the ear heard, neither has it entered into the heart of man," but which God "hath revealed by His Spirit."

George D. Wolff.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN AMERICAN HISTORY.

1. President Grant's Speech at DesMoines. Delivered at the Reunion of the Army of the Tennessee, Sept., 29th, 1875.
2. The Annual Message of the President of the United States to Congress. 1875.

Catholics have been building churches for the worship of God according to the dictates of their conscience, in which that worship is performed with all reverent solemnity; they have been building asylums for the orphan, the aged, the insane, those whom society has depraved or seeks to ruin; they have been building colleges, seminaries of learning, schools of every grade, making for the education and relief of their people exertions such as none of the sects have ever done; and they have meanwhile been doing their duty as citizens, as promptly and as fully as any of their fellow-citizens.

Suddenly they are arraigned as evil-doers, and a cry, sounded at first by a disappointed bookseller, has been reëchoed till the Chief Magistrate of the Republic departs from his constitutional line of duty to invoke, for their annoyance and molestation, the powers of Congress in a proposed modification of the Constitution of the United States.

What evil have they done that the great charter of the land should be moulded to war especially on them; that bolts should be forged that will pass innocuous over the heads of every other religious body, and strike the Catholic alone? Surely Catholics are as ardent supporters of American liberty in 1875, as they were in 1775, when John Wesley and the Wesleyans denounced it, and the American Catholics with their priests, once all Jesuits, supported it to a man; and stood by the cause sturdily, when men like Arnold made their Protestantism a pretext for deserting the cause.

Has the Catholic Church in the United States anything in its present existence or its past history that can make the Catholic feel that in the presence of his fellow-citizen he should hang his head in shame? Surely not. From the very first discovery to the present her history is full of heroic self-devotedness, of earnest endeavor to minister to all men, to civilize, to instruct, to console, to enlighten.

The earliest explorers of our coasts were Catholics, and when they first landed, they planted the symbol of the cross, and so studded their maps with names from the Church Calendar, that we can trace their course by them. The lapse of years, the vicissitudes of war, the incoming of settlers with new-learned views, have not effaced them. When America took her rank among the nations, she claimed as her bounds the River of the Holy Cross and the River of St. Mary: beyond the estuary of St. Helen. It was the same in the interior, from St. Regis to the western river of St. Joseph and the rapids of Sault Ste. Marie. Catholicity had recorded her early presence as discoverer and explorer on the soil of the Republic of a century ago. Each accession of territory brought in new proofs of Catholic discovery, exploration and settlement: St. Augustine on the South, St. Louis on the West, the City of the Holy Faith, and California with San Francisco, as in a mediæval painting, amid a group of saints.

When European settlements began on the coast, Catholic Spain endeavored to colonize and conquer Florida and the northern shore of the gulf; succeeding at last in establishing a feeble settlement in Florida after a terrible deed of blood. Dominican missionaries at once began to instruct and civilize the natives. Cancer, a hero of the noblest type, laid down his life, to witness that the Church took no part in any cruelty of his countrymen. Missionaries of other orders followed to labor and to die. Dominican, Jesuit, Franciscan, planted the crops in Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and even on the banks of the Rappahannock, before Raleigh thought of American expeditions. New Mexico was colonized and churches built by Indian converts, before the Pilgrims left England for the Low Countries. The labors of the missionaries remain, and the earliest records of the Territory are found in the writings of the devoted heralds of the cross. Schools were established and Indians learned to read and write, as documents from them in Spanish archives remain to prove.

On the north France settled Canada, and her missionaries rivalled those of Spain in their zeal and heroic fortitude. With no weapon but a crucifix, they threaded the interior of the continent, revealing its wonderful elements of greatness, its mineral wealth, its mighty rivers and teeming soil. Often in peril, often perishing by the hand of violence or the very exhaustion of nature, none were deterred by the fate of loved and revered companions, but they kept steadily on; Franciscan, Jesuit and secular priest laboring and winning souls; cultured men abandoning, for Christ's sake, the very presence and sight of civilization in their high and noble purpose. More than one of these missionaries, in his apostolic journeys, passed from the mouth of the St. Lawrence to the Mississippi and Texas to return by sea, making the circuit of all that the United States was a century ago.

They contributed, too, to the well-being of settlers; not only by their Christian ministry, but by developing agriculture, and the resources of the country. They introduced the orange, the sugar-cane and the vine at the south; they raised the first wheat crops of Illinois; discovered the salt springs of New York, the oil springs of Pennsylvania, and worked the first copper on Lake Superior.

When English colonies came, Catholics settling Maryland, Terra Mariæ, made it a home for the persecuted and gave all Christians equal rights; but found too soon that toleration was deemed in many parts "an evil egg," and disfranchised in a colony they had founded on the principle of justice to the the red man, and religious liberty to all, the Maryland Catholics passed a century of oppression, the severity of which the ancient statutes attest. The little settlement of Catholics in Maryland, with St. Mary's as a capital, is the nucleus of the present Catholic body in the United States; the French and Spanish feebler element on the borders merging into it as in this century it acquired its wondrous development. The Catholics of England and her colonies owned no special gratitude to James I. or his son, but in the civil war they found a deadly fanaticism against them in the Puritan party; and this, while it may not have weighed in their hearty support of the Cavaliers, or induced it, made them extremely obnoxious. The only battle of the English civil war fought in America, took place in Maryland; and the Maryland cavaliers, chiefly Catholics, were crushed by the Parliamentarians. The power of the new ascendency was not weakened after the Restoration; while the fall of James II., bringing in a new anti-Catholic element, led on both sides of the Atlantic to legal enactments of the most oppressive nature. The Maryland Catholics were disfranchised in the colony they had founded; loaded with double taxes, deprived of arms, excluded from the witness box and made as low as the negro slave. Yet most of them were gentry; and as the younger members were frequently sent abroad to obtain polish and culture in European colleges, their numbers included some of the most accomplished men in the colonies. Every Jacobite movement and every suspected movement increased their burthens, till weary of what seemed past endurance they proposed to the French king to settle in Lousiana. Formalities and delays of bureaus deferred action so long that the Maryland Catholics abandoned the project. The wiser heads among them read the signs of the times. A struggle was at hand, and in the day of need, Maryland might welcome the able heads and brave arms of her injured sons.

Virginia at an early day caught the alarm from Maryland; and she, with few Catholics on her soil, held up in terror her long list of penal laws; and the proclamations of her governors show how active they were in seeking to prevent any priest from entering the colony.

New England, with all the Puritan bitterness against Catholics found the feeling quickened by the proximity of French colonies, with a population weak in point of numbers, but strong in energy and dash. Penal laws of great severity were soon passed, threatening long imprisonment to any priest who ventured upon the soil. The bigotry was so deep that it drew many miseries on the New England colonies. The French in Canada, conscious of their real weakness and of the difficulty of defence, sought a friendly intercourse with New England. They proffered free trade, but so great was the fear of any Catholic influence that the offer was rejected. When the time came when the colonies were likely to be involved by European wars, the Canadians proposed that in the event of war the colonies should on both sides refrain from hostility. This proposition was rejected. As a last effort, the Canadians asked that Indians should be used on neither side: but even this was refused. To the excited and bigoted mind of New England, the French colonies were a stronghold of Catholicity, which it was their duty to destroy; and there was to be no truce or peace with them. The demolition of Catholic Churches, the profanation of altars, pictures and statues in structures dedicated to Catholic worship, was ever a leading thought, and it was carried out on many occasions. In the expedition against Louisburg, the chaplain of the New England forces bore an axe on his shoulders to carry out the unchristian work. Bitter as the feeling was in England, the conduct of New England in desecrating churches was pointedly rebuked.

New York, settled by Dutch Calvinists as earnest in their faith as their New England brethren, showed less virulence. Laws prohibited the exercise of the Catholic worship, but practically there was little restriction. Yet though nearly one-half the population of Holland, then as now, was Catholic, no trace of any Catholic emigration appears. The Dutch relations with Canada were friendly, and to the settlers of New Netherland Catholics will ever feel grateful for the charity extended by them to missionaries like Jogues, Bressani and Poncet, while prisoners in the hands of the Indians.

When the Dutch colony passed into the hands of England, the Catholic Duke of York became Proprietor, and granted to Penn and others what became New Jersey and Pennsylvania. These colonies thus seemed to afford an opening for Catholic settlers; but though New York was for a time under a Catholic governor, Colonel Thomas Dongan, in whose time the Colony had its first assembly, which passed a bill of rights establishing religious freedom, no considerable number of Catholic emigrants came in, and the few English Jesuits who labored there for a time retired when James fell. Then under William came a strong anti-Catholic feeling. Penal laws of the most stringent type were passed, and in the coming wars New York was led away to follow the course of New England; but after the massacre of Lachine and its retaliation in Schenectady, New York took counsel of common sense rather than of bigotry, and by agreeing to neutrality saved her frontiers from the Indian border wars that New England welcomed.

At the south, the Spaniards in Florida excited a fanaticism in South Carolina, and the invasions of the Catholic province were marked by bitter manifestations whenever victory attended the arms of Carolina. Missionaries were slaughtered amid their neophytes; Christian Indians were driven as prisoners to Charleston to be sold as slaves; only one man, the Quaker Archdale, attempting to check the practice. At St. Augustine religious edifices were not spared, and an indignant Englishman reproaches his countrymen with destroying a fine library, and not even sparing from the flames the Holy Scriptures themselves.

The whole spirit of the country was thus anti-Catholic to a greater degree even than in England. Hence during the earlier part of the eighteenth century there was very little Catholic emigration. The Catholic body in Maryland received no accessions; a few, chiefly Germans and Irish, settled in friendly Pennsylvania, where from the first they had been covertly protected; elsewhere there were Irish and Scotch Catholics sent over and sold, or redemptioners who sold themselves to pay their passage to America: and at a later date the unfortunate Acadians were torn from their homes, and scattered along the coast from Massachusetts to Georgia.

The Catholics in Maryland had from the settlement of the colony enjoyed the ministrations of some Jesuit Fathers; and as Maryland youths went abroad to receive a college education, some entered the order to return in time to labor in their own colony. This little body of priests in Maryland thus before long had some native members. Besides them there were no other priests in the colonies, except a few Franciscans whose labors extended from the early days of the colony down to the commencement of the eighteenth century. These priests occasionally visited Catholic families in Virginia, and more freely penetrated into Pennsylvania and even New Jersey, reaching New York, however, only just before the outbreak of the revolution.

Churches there were none. The modest chapel under the same roof as the house quietly avoided observation. Nor were there schools for the disfranchised, overtaxed Catholics.

Meanwhile France, occupying the valley of the Mississippi, endeavored to hold the Ohio, and close in by forts on the colony of New York. A terrible struggle was at hand for the mastery of North America, and a strong anti-Catholic feeling was aroused throughout the whole land. The French threw up a fort at the source of the Ohio, before English colonists knew clearly whether the spot was in Pennsylvania or Virginia, and priests were saying mass in the chapel of Our Lady just over the mountains. There were similar forts at Niagara and Crown Point. Poor Catholic indentured servants soon learned this, and struck through the wilderness by the first underground railroad for these spots, where they could once more enjoy the blessing of taking part in the Awful Sacrifice. But their flight only deepened the feeling against those who remained.

The struggle of Canada was desperate and heroic. Almost abandoned by France she fought every inch of territory till hope vanished. Then England ruled from Hudson Bay to the Gulf of Mexico. But the spirit of bigotry which she had evoked and fostered was not soon laid. To govern the conquered realm of Canada was a question for English statesmen. They could not treat the whole Canadian population as they had done the Acadians, and make a desert of land reclaimed by a century and a quarter of toil. Sound policy counselled concession. The Canadian Catholics were to be encouraged to remain by the promise that their religious rights should not be infringed. Church, and convent, and hospital were to stand; the wayside cross was not to be demolished; the priest might say mass openly beneath the English flag. The Jesuit and Franciscan alone fell under the ban, and even with them, it was only decreed that no new members should be received; the Fathers were left in quiet possession of their houses, and in the discharge of their mission duty, till the last survivor expired.

This course of the British government came like a thunderbolt on the colonies, which had helped with blood and treasure to reduce the hated Catholic settlement. The fruit of their victory was gone. After all their sacrifices, they were to behold Catholicity actually protected and upheld by the strong arm of England. Of all the grievances which rankled in the colonial heart, none excited deeper feeling against England than what they could not but feel to be an act of deepest treachery towards them. The very bigotry and intolerance that England had fostered now turned against her, and nerved men to break off all the ties of kindred, nationality and government. In the northern colonies, that bordered on Canada, the feeling was especially intense; and when the struggle was imminent, the first colonial flag run up at New York in place of the English colors bore the words: "No Popery."

Anti-Catholic bigotry kindled the flames of the American Revolution: but when the delegates of the colonies met, there were statesmen fit for the great mission. The spirit of the country was nobler, broader and better than that of the isolated communities. The Catholics from Maine to Georgia, from the Atlantic to the Mississippi; the Jesuits, or rather ex-Jesuits, for the society was no more, with their flocks on from Virginia to New York; as well as the Canadian priest in far-off Illinois, with his flock of French and Indians, comprising all the Catholics in the country, with their clergy, at once took sides earnestly and heartily in the national cause; and two Catholics, a priest and a layman, formed part of a delegation sent to Canada to win that colony to alliance or neutrality, but found their labors thwarted by the anti-Catholic bigotry of Jay. There were no tories, no falterers and final deserters among them; none to shout for Congress, while they carefully carried a British protection for emergencies. The Catholics were to a man, with their clergy, staunch and true, which can be said of none of the sects; for the Methodists following the course of their founder, Wesley, were all on the Tory side, and nearly every other denomination was divided. Strange that in a Fourth of July address in 1875, a Wesleyan minister should be boasting as though his fellow believers had been all Whigs in 1775, and denouncing Jesuits; when in 1775 every Jesuit and every man of their flocks was a Whig, and even the Canadian Jesuits, so friendly to the American cause as to incur censure. Catholics bore their part bravely—the Carrolls, Fitzsimmons and others—in Congress or State Legislatures; Moylan and Barry, with many a humbler hero, in the army and navy. But the struggle was an unequal one. America, in her need, looked for aid to Catholic France.

A revulsion at once took place. For a time bigotry was silenced. The French officers who first came over won friends everywhere; the French army and fleet with their chaplains were welcomed, and even the selectmen of Boston took part in Catholic services, to the intense delight of the Tory paper in New York, which taunted them with their sudden conversion. The influence extended. Rhode Island dropped an anti-Catholic law. Pope's day ceased to be kept in New England, and the celebration of that long-kept November holiday was, we may say, abolished by a fiat of George Washington.

When America finally triumphed by the aid of her Catholic ally, the war which had begun with a long nurtured hatred of Catholicity closed with a most friendly feeling towards a Church to which the ancestors of all had belonged for centuries.

Some of the States had constitutions adopted in the outset of the struggle; and these, as in the case of New York, were deeply tinged with the spirit of that day. The States that drew up later their fundamental charters were more liberal, and made all religions equal in the eye of the law.

The establishment of the Republic found the Catholic body centered in Maryland, Virginia and Pennsylvania, with a few owing their origin to the British Isles and their colonies, amounting in all to about 45,000; while the French in Michigan, Indiana and Illinois, numbered not over 10,000 more. They were under the care of a small body of priests; most of whom, if not all, had been members of the Society of Jesus before its suppression; they were, as secular priests, subject to the Vicar Apostolic of the London District in England, but had not during the war been able to communicate with him. The Catholics in the West, of Canadian origin, were in the diocese of Quebec, and the priests in charge subject to the bishop of that see.

Left isolated by the war, these Catholics desired an independent organization, and addressed the Holy See on the subject. Rome acted with her usual caution. She wished to give no offence to the government of the new Republic, to do nothing that could offend any susceptibility, or excite prejudice. Through the nuncio at Paris and the American representative in France, the Pope, in 1783, asked the consent of Congress to the creation of a Vicar Apostolic or Apostolical Prefect in some city. The scheme of government laid down by the Articles of Confederation gave Congress no power to act in regard to religious matters, and the reply left the Pope free to act according to his own prudence. The

American Catholics were, in 1784, placed temporarily under the Rev. John Carroll, as Prefect Apostolic, Franklin recommending him earnestly as a man of superior ability, a zealous priest, and a sincere patriot. The wishes of the Catholic priesthood and people had centered on the same man, and when the Pope subsequently established the see of Baltimore, Nov 6, 1789, Carroll became Bishop of Baltimore.

He had everything to create. Emigration began to the new land of freedom. Little bodies of Catholics appeared at all the larger ports. Seminaries, colleges, schools were needed. It was the day of religious schools. Throughout the country there were Catholic schools; doctrine was taught with the letters; and men held that the best citizens were those trained in the religious spirit. This idea was exactly that of the Catholic Church; and, from the moment her children in the United States acquired freedom to this day, she has, in unison with this genuine American system, labored to give the State good citizens by making good Catholics. Georgetown College was founded, the pioneer of all the Catholic universities; schools were established beside the rising churches, and preparations made to found a divinity school. And in this great work help came from an unexpected source. Infidelity overturned the ancient monarchy of France, placed Christianity under a ban, and sent the clergy to the scaffold or to exile. Many priests, eminent for learning, zeal and piety, fully conversant with the laws of the Church, and familiar with all its ritual, came to America and were gladly welcomed by Bishop Carroll. Zealous priests came, too, from Ireland, men of devotion and learning: but, had the formation of the new church been confined to them and the American clergy, it might long have borne the character of the church in the British Isles, as modified by two centuries of oppression. Providentially an element came to raise it to the position it should occupy in a free State. The Catholic shook off the habits and language of inferiority so studiously imposed upon him.

The long European wars swelled emigration, and the Catholic Church for nearly fifty years increased without a check, winning the good will of the citizens of all denominations; new bishoprics being established in 1808 at Boston, New York and Philadelphia, and Bardstown; and the diocese of Baltimore, which had embraced the whole United States, was divided. A colony of Carmelite nuns came from Europe, a Visitation convent and a community of Sisters of Charity sprang up in the East, with similar organizations in the West; giving to America the example of convent life, women nobly devoting their lives to education and works of charity.

This halcyon period lasted, we may say, during the first half-century of our national existence. There were occasional controversies, sporadic ebullitions of old prejudice; but the infidel doctrines of the French Revolution made Protestants in America disposed to regard Catholics favorably, as fellow-combatants against the great anti-Christian army.

After the restoration of peace in Europe, emigration to America increased very rapidly, especially from Ireland; and then began, on the British Isles, a movement among the Catholics to obtain from the English government an emancipation from the slavery, to which the penal laws reduced them. Their demand aroused the most bitter anti-Catholic element, and the press teemed with denunciations of Popery, with violent philippics, heated controversy, and even forgeries.

In America, while the Catholics sympathized with their fellow-believers abroad and met to encourage their undertaking, on the other hand Protestants, drinking deep from the English literature of the day, began to look with alarm at the increase of Catholicity in the land. The half-century of good conduct in the Catholic body went for naught. By the help of aids to vision from abroad, they began to discover a terrible state of things in their midst. A blind fanaticism succeeded the half-century of good feeling, and a systematic warfare against Catholicity was begun, and has been carried on with a pertinacity, a skill in raising new issues and misstating the case, which has few parallels in history.

When Catholic emancipation was won in England, the Catholic Church in the United States had spread throughout the land, and in almost every state there was a considerable body of believers. Louisiana had come in with a Catholic population and a bishop's see; Florida with a few Catholics and her old traditions. In 1833 the first Provincial Council, ever held north of Mexico, met at Baltimore. Archbishop Whitfield presided, surrounded by Bishop David, coadjutor of Bardstown, Ky., Bishop England of Charleston, Bishop Rosati of St. Louis, Bishop Dubois of New York, Bishop Portier of Mobile, Bishop Kenrick, coadjutor of Philadelphia, Bishop Résé of Detroit, and Bishop Purcell of Cincinnati, convened with all the forms required by the canons and usages of the Church in a Provincial Council, to form laws better adapted for the great ends in view, the increase of piety and the due celebration of divine worship, the elevation of clergy and laity, and especially greater union and harmony among them.

It was the first Provincial Council held in any English speaking country since the Reformation, and the first held in any country during the century. America thus led the way to the revival of this ancient usage, and thus prepared for the holding of a General Council.

In view of the coming attack on the Church in the United States, this organization was all the more necessary to bind all parts together, and enable it to cope with the unscrupulous enemies about to assail it.

The Church had thus a life of its own, with theological seminaries at Baltimore, Emmittsburg, Barrens, Mo., and elsewhere; colleges at Georgetown, Baltimore, Emmittsburg, Cincinnati, and some other points; with academies, asylums for orphans, for the deaf and dumb, hospitals and schools in all parts of the country, most of these being under the direction of religious orders, Jesuits, Dominicans, Lazarists, Sulpitians, Visitation and Ursuline Nuns, Sisters of Charity, Sisters of Loretto; and in the recent terrible visitation of the cholera, the devotion of the Catholic priesthood and sisterhoods had been so eminent, that its influence exalted the individuals in the public eye, and invested them with a halo that was galling to bigots. To their eyes something must be done to diminish the influence. Catholic sisters and clergy had acted the part of good Samaritans; they were to be stoned as an example.

The moral tone of the country was higher then than now, the Protestant clergymen of more dignity and purity of life. The old Puritan spirit had not been altogether lost, and this state of affairs enabled the unscrupulous enemies of the Catholics to appeal to a strong feeling, when they opened the campaign against the Catholics by charges of great immorality in the convents and religious institutions. The Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk, the most shameless imposture in the history of American literature, was thrown upon the public, accusing the nuns of the Hotel Dieu, Montreal; and though the utter mendacity of the work was exposed by a Protestant editor of New York, William L. Stone, many of the Protestant clergy upheld the book, and Stone was attacked in prose and verse for what was deemed unnecessary honesty. This vile book was followed by others, one, "Six Months in a Convent," being connected with the riot, in which a mob, roused to frenzy by intemperate preachers, attacked and destroyed the Ursuline Convent at Charlestown, Massachusetts.

This deed of violence caused a revulsion, and a new plan of action was adopted. Men seemed to forget truth and honesty. A so-called reprint of the Rhemish Testament of 1582 appeared, and a number of clergymen attested that it was reprinted exactly from the original of 1582; yet an examination will convince any bibliographer that these gentlemen had not the original edition before them, but printed from a well-known anti-Catholic work.

Men who could so far forget truth and honor were not likely to hesitate. At this time, too, the Bible Society took decided ground as a sectarian, anti-Catholic body. It had already mutilated the Bible by omitting the deutero-canonical books, but had continued to print Catholic versions in French, Spanish and Portuguese, for distribution among Catholics. Now these were suppressed, the plates broken up, the piles of unissued copies burned, and Protestant versions issued, with all the errors and mistranslations of the King James carefully reproduced. A general system of proselytizing among Catholics was initiated, and has been persevered in to the present time. Societies for benevolent purposes, the relief of the poor, sailors' aid societies, the almshouses, and other eleemosynary institutions of the State, asylums for the Reformation of Juvenile Delinquents, and school organizations as they then existed, were all made instruments for depriving Catholics of all opportunity of being imbued with the doctrines and principles of their own faith, and of instilling into them a shame for it, and for inculcating direct Protestant teaching. In many parts the State actually seemed to abdicate its high office, and to become merely part of the machinery of Protestant Home Missionary Societies for the "conversion" of Catholics. By party tactics and special legislation, the voice of Catholics, in any locality where their numbers had increased, was cleverly neutralized, so that the work of State proselytism should proceed unchecked. This policy has been steadily pursued to the present day; and this mania for proselytizing Catholics is the source of all the troubles that have arisen. A general system of education that would have satisfied Catholics and Protestants, and trained up religiously a generation of citizens, was possible forty years ago, but is now almost out of the question. Even in the State of New York, where the Catholic population must be nearly one-fourth, the Board of Regents of the University, the head of the educational department of the State, is, and always has been, exclusively Protestant: no Catholic has ever been appointed, and some of the members always are Protestant clergymen. In the city of New York, where the Catholic population is nearly, if not absolutely half, a Board of Education, chosen by the people, might contain some Catholics; hence, by special law, the appointment of the Board is vested in the Mayor, and that official at once appointed more than twelve Presbyterians and but one single Catholic, and yet the Presbyterians are now complaining of some act giving privileges to a Catholic school.

This is the day of small politicians; but America will yet produce statesmen as of old, and some one among them will before long examine this question of State Proselytism — Should the State enter this field of proselytizing, or should it, like the "Society for Propagating the Gospel" in Boston, declare distinctly and clearly, that it is no part of its business to lure young or old from one Christian denomination to another? He will, by examination of statistics, show his countrymen, how this wholesale proselytizing has increased immeasurably the dangerous classes of the community, by a result not difficult to see. It is a trite saying, that it is easier to pull down than to build up. It has been easy to make weak and ignorant Catholics ashamed of their faith, abandon its sacraments and aids to a better life, cast aside respect for its ministry, and neglect to contribute to its support; but it is not easy to implant into such minds, once imbued with religious doubt, a new faith that will bring any moral influence over them. In most cases they become utterly irreligious, and plunge recklessly into vice, amid the temptatious of great cities, and the corruptions of our political system. This result is due also to the fact, that with the increase of wealth, and the broader line between rich and poor, Protestantism is rapidly ceasing to be the religion of the poor, or to exercise even its former limited influence among them. It can pervert, but it cannot produce from its perverts moral, God-fearing citizens.

Proselytizing was now thoroughly systematized. The early schools of the country had been religious; but as the non-church goers increased, numbers of children were unprovided for. To instruct these the Public School Society in New York, and similar organizations elsewhere, were formed, avowedly only to supplement the Church Schools, as acts of incorporation attest. These schools, though of no denomination in particular, were Protestant and intensely sectarian; the books often being most unjust and offensive to Catholics. Gradually in New York the Public School Society's schools took the lead, and the Protestant Church Schools declined, especially after the discovery of a fraud practised by the Bethel Baptist School. And finally, all aid to Church Schools was dropped. To revive the old New York system, Catholics asked that their schools should be put on the same ground as the Protestant Public School Society's Schools; or that those schools, on receiving aid derived from taxes paid by Catholics and Protestants, should furnish education satisfactory to Catholics as well as to Protestants. This led to the famous Public School Debate before the New York Common Council in October, 1844, in which Archbishop Hughes, pleading the Catholic cause with eloquence, zeal and moderation, became known to the whole country as one of the ablest men of his day. The petition of the Catholics was denied: an agitation began; the cry was then raised, and has since continued, that the Catholics wished to drive *the* Bible from the public schools. Both political parties in the coming election pledged themselves to resist the Catholic appeal for free unsectarian education, or the restoration of the old New York system of religious schools. The Catholics voted an independent ticket, and their numbers and unity so influenced the result that both political parties seemed ready to make some concessions to justice. The present system of State Schools was established, and, though fair in intent, has been brought under the control of the Protestant proselytizing sects so as to be actually bitterly sectarian. The old cry of "The Bible," is raised from time to time; but in all the discussions it is somewhat curious, and by no means creditable to the logical acumen of courts and legislative bodies, that the term "The Bible" has never been defined. If it is defined, The Bible must be the books received by the majority of Christians throughout the world, in the original text, or a text based on the best manuscripts, or a translation from such a text. The book forced into the schools by the proselytizing spirit has none of these characters, and it can be denied that *the* Bible has ever been in them. The volume now issued by the Bible Society does not contain all the books received by the majority of Christians; it does not contain all the books found in the Bible as issued by James I., and still issued by authority in England; nor in the old Geneva Bible, which the Pilgrim Fathers brought to America, and clung to so fondly, while they looked with scorn on the King James. The Bible Society's volume is based on the so-called "Received Text," which is utterly unsustained by the older manuscripts, and was, so far as the New Testament is concerned, hastily prepared by Erasmus from very incorrect and defective codices. The very Lord's Prayer in this so-called Bible is admitted by all scholars to be spurious; and if spurious, as all American translators have admitted, certainly blasphemous; yet in the sectarian spirit of proselytism, it is forced into the schools.

The School Question coming into the legislative bodies, has, since 1840, made the Catholic question a political one; and Catholics have had to meet the proselytizing spirit by attempts to free the schools from Protestant sectarianism; and where the attempt is seen to be hopeless, by erecting schools of their own, and submitting to the iniquity which taxes them to educate their neighbors.

The charge of immorality brought against Catholic institutions had fallen; the charge that they neglected education had fallen. The Church was steadily increasing; new dioceses were formed, and each gathered its own institutions of charity and learning. The German emigration, which had begun to attain a vast extent, brought many Catholics; and the emigration from all lands brought much skilled labor, that came into active competition with American mechanics. Out of these various influences arose a mongrel party, called the Native American, which objected to Irish Catholics as Irish Catholics, to American Catholics in general, to all foreigners, especially Catholic, who cheapened American labor. This agitation then begun, culminated in 1844, just about ten or eleven years after that Maria Monk campaign. The recurrence since, at periods of about ten or eleven years, of an anti-Catholic agitation, springs from several causes. The Protestant clergy in the United States, for a body educated and expected to appear as gentlemen, are, excepting the popular clergymen of the day in large cities, the most wretchedly paid set of professional men in the country. Their salaries do not average five hundred dollars, far less than a successful and industrious mechanic earns. Their stipends, low as they are, are not secured; they depend on their congregations. Now Protestantism has properly no worship; it has no rite, essential to the worship of God. A man may be a good Protestant, read his Bible at home, and go to no Church. There is no service which binds him to attend under pain of sin: it is simply a matter of choice, a very good thing to go, and the proper thing for a man with a family; but there is no feeling of moral responsibility compelling him to attend. As a natural consequence, men grow indifferent; they go for a time, but as the preaching is the main thing, they easily tire, and drop off. In about ten years, by inherent causes, a paying Protestant congregation will be brought to a period of difficulty. A general arousing is needed to bring the lukewarm and indifferent to the churches, and to awake in them an interest in religious affairs. Protestantism has no distinctive positive tenets, as it has no worship; its strong rallying point, and its only one, is protesting against Rome. Hence every ten or eleven years a campaign against the Catholics is an actual necessity, to save Protestant churches from extinction, and the Protestant clergy from starvation.

The charge of immorality, which had been played so boldly in 1834, was less available in 1844. The movement was more political, and guided by unscrupulous politicians, whose coarse brutal tools were sufficiently fanaticized by anti-popery sermons and diatribes. A chance collision in Philadelphia led to fearful riots, in which the churches, schools and houses of Catholics were pillaged and burned; and a valuable library was committed to the flames. The city authorities were paralyzed, inefficient or secretly hostile, and the strong arm of the State alone checked the course of arson and murder. The malcontents ere long renewed their violence as a distinct rebellion against authority, to be again crushed by the strong hand of the law. This spirit of violence found an echo elsewhere in deeds of violence; and New York, where the so-called Native Americans had just elected one of the publishers of Maria Monk to the mayoralty, was saved from similar scenes only by the firmness of the outgoing mayor, and the attitude of the Catholics.

When this storm passed away, the Catholic body in the United States numbered about a million and a quarter, divided into 21 dioceses, and one Vicariate Apostolic, that of Oregon. They had 675 churches, clustering chiefly in Maryland, Pennsylvania and

Southern New York, in other parts scattered very sparingly; Arkansas having but two, Tennessee three, Mississippi, though a State originally settled by Catholics, only five; but the new Western States showing already large and increasing numbers. Of the clergy, 572 priests were engaged in mission duty, and 137 in seminaries, colleges and religious houses; 220 young men were preparing for the ministry; there were 91 colleges and academies; 94 charitable institutions. The increase in Catholic churches, since the former anti-Catholic campaign of 1835, had been from 272 to 675; of priests, from 327 to 709. The Church had an active press. The remarkably philosophic mind of Orestes A. Brownson, who had just entered the bosom of the Church, made his Review a vehicle for the soundest and ablest discussions of questions underlying all government and society, and for treating Catholic questions upon a basis and with a genius that could not be ignored, but that the statesman and the scholar felt himself compelled to read and to grapple: there were monthly magazines, weekly papers. Religious orders, which sprung up spontaneously from the very vitality of Catholicity, had dotted the land with their houses; not indeed the grand abbeys of the middle ages, which even in ruins command respect; but modest homes, where the rules of olden days were kept as rigorously amid the new scenes of a new land, as in hoary Europe. Augustinians and Dominicans carried one back to the Middle Ages, Jesuits to the period of the great Apostasy, Lazarists and Redemptorists to later centuries; while Carmelite, Dominican, Ursuline and Visitation Nuns, labored beside the more recent Sisters of Charity, of the Sacred Heart, of the Good Shepherd, of Notre Dame, of Loretto, of Mercy, of Providence, and of our Lady of Mercy.

The incessant struggle had accumulated the inherent force and energy of the Church to meet its pressing wants. It made men earnest, where they would have been careless; but the increase of churches, with their necessary schools, asylums, and other institutions, had overtasked the resources of the Catholic body, and their clerical labors had overtasked the priesthood. There was little room for the development of mere æsthetics. Hence the Catholic influence on the country at large, then, and even now, is slight. The tactics of parties exclude Catholics almost entirely from all higher offices in the country. We have had one Catholic among the Chief Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States; a few, very few, members of the United States Senate; scarcely a single Cabinet officer; here and there a Catholic reaches the position of governor of a State, but too rarely to be noted. The army and the navy show many Catholic officers, whose record is of the noblest. In literature, science and the arts, we have made little mark, and are behind even the modest position of the country at large. At the earliest period, Matthew Carey and Robert Walsh occupied a higher position in general literature than any Catholic does at the present day. Even the wonderful ability and depth of Doctor Brownson in his Review, in his American Republic that should be a classic, and in his minor works, have failed to take their place among far inferior works, and are seldom noticed in writing or speech in such a way as to show their influence.

Archbishop Hughes left no great work to take its place in the literature of the country, great as was his influence in life; and the same may be said of Bishop England. Archbishop Kenrick, in his varied learning, enriched our Catholic rather than the national literature by his Theology, his Essay on the Primacy of the Apostolic See, and his version of the Bible. Archbishop Spalding took a more popular tone, and in lighter paths for Catholic readers there are names of merit, but few that will make an enduring reputation. In the field of history O'Callaghan, McSherry, Meline and others have indeed won a place by critical research, sound judgment and eloquent narration. In poetry Shea and McGee will be remembered by some of their minor poems which found their way to collections; but we have no poet to rank with Longfellow, Bryant and Whittier. Thebaud, in his Irish Race and still more in his Gentilism, lays claim to a higher position in the more serious school of general literature. Still it must be confessed that on the whole we are behindhand. Our college course is perhaps too elementary; and Catholics even more than their neighbors, perhaps, underrate literary culture, and in their anxiety to throw their sons into the world of business and care, deprive some of that learned leisure that is needed for great and enduring work. Among the clergy the science, learning and ability that might add laurels to the body are often kept unused by the severe toils of missionary life or by modest diffidence; and an occasional article in some magazine, unnoticed, and hence unappreciated, alone reveals what might be.

It must be admitted, too, that although industry, talent and probity have brought to many Catholics, in professional and mercantile life, great earthly rewards in wealth and means, these successful men have produced few men of such public spirit as we behold in the various Protestant denominations. While every college under Protestant influence shows its scholarships, professorships, special schools and libraries established and endowed by individuals, there is scarcely a case to be met with of similar Catholic liberality. It is still more rare to find a church or institution of any kind among us built or endowed by a wealthy Catholic. What has been accomplished hitherto has been mainly the work of the poor; but the wealthy Catholics seem sadly lacking in public spirit. Yet, the noblest monument a man could erect would be a church or an institution. There are monuments in our cemeteries, mere ornamental structures, evidences of family pride, which have cost more than would have built a beautiful church to stand for a century, where Mass would be said constantly for the founder. Better an hospital for the sick or afflicted than a palace for the dead; better something Christian than anything so essentially Pagan.

The Indian missions form the opening chapter of the history of the Church in the United States, and they continue to furnish matter for record. In spite of the changes of flag from France and Spain to England and the United States, Maine still has Catholic Indians descended from converts of the missionaries from Deiullete in the 17th to Rale in the 18th century. New York has Catholic Indians, fruits of the mission founded by Jogues, while the Dutch held Manhattan; Michigan and Wisconsin are in the same condition. But there were new fields in the Indians removed to the West. The Jesuits began missions among the Pottawatomies and Osages in 18—, and in a few years planted the Cross among the Flatheads and other tribes of the Rocky Mountains, DeSmet devoting his life to extend the missions, chiefly by means and by missionaries whom his fervor drew from Europe. New Mexico and California came in with Indian converts of the older Catholic missions, those in the former dating back to the sixteenth century. The Archbishop of Oregon and his suffragans still direct the missions they began as humble laborers in the vineyard. The Protestant denominations had not been idle among our western or transplanted tribes. Their success among the Cherokees, Creeks and Choctaws had been marked in bringing those tribes on the path to civilization. In other places they failed, and the zeal of the people to support these missions, often barren of results, declined. The result may be seen in the Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs issued in 1861: out of seventy-seven missionaries engaged among the Indians, nineteen were Catholics; and the number apparently did not include the New Mexican and Californian priests who attended Indians as part of their settled flocks. This seems to have excited anti-Catholic zeal, and schemes were set on foot to break up or neutralize the Catholic missionaries as far as possible. The civil war paralyzed all for a time; but the project was renewed soon after the peace, and managed insiduously but effectually.

In 1870 the President, after appointing a board of commissioners and calling upon the Friends to aid in establishing honesty in the intercourse with the Indians, formed a plan of dividing the various tribes among the religious denominations of the country. This ostensibly was unobjectionable, and did not seem to be a movement intended to strike at the Catholics; yet that was almost the sole object. The Catholics, in 1861, supplied one-fourth the missionaries then engaged, and thus gave one-fourth the mission force. But in the division of agencies and superintendencies, not a single superintendency was assigned to the Catholics: sixteen agencies were given to the Friends, five to the Baptists, ten to the Presbyterians, two to the Christians, who never, that we can find, had any Indian missions; fourteen to the Methodists, eight to the Episcopalians, eight to other Protestant denominations, making sixty-three in all; while to the Catholics only seven were allotted: the Pueblos of New Mexico, who had been converted by Catholic missionaries before there was a Protestant settler within our territory, were allotted to the Christians, and have since been passed to the Presbyterians; in the same way the Catholic Kansas, Osages, Chippewas, Yakamas, Pimas and others, were placed under the control of agents appointed by other denominations; and these agents had the power to appoint missionaries, and to prevent the Catholic missionary from setting foot within his Indian reservation, and he could also punish the Indians for going off the reservation to attend a Catholic church, if the missionary erected a chapel on free ground. Tribe after tribe has appealed to government, but their complaints and appeals have been alike disregarded. The Catholic Indians were to be dragooned out of the Catholic Church, and if possible into some Protestant form. It is scarcely to be believed, yet it is a fact spread on the pages of government documents, that a Methodist agent thus placed over Catholic Indians complained to government and sought to have a priest punished, for telling the Indians that the agent's appointment by government did not empower him to administer baptism and act as a clergyman for them. The man was so confident that all ecclesiastical powers were conferred upon him by his appointment as agent, that he actually wished all gainsayers punished. He probably mistook General Grant for Henry VIII. in taking him to be the Head of the Church, and wished the offending Catholic missionary beheaded, like More and Fisher, for denying the Royal supremacy.

The Catholic hierarchy selected a gentleman to act at Washington in behalf of these dragooned Catholic Indians, and societies for their relief have been projected; but government has sternly refusen to do justice: the appeals are unheeded, as will be the recent request of Sioux Chiefs for Catholic missionaries. It is a sad spectacle for America to offer to European contemplation in the Centennial Year.

In this, as in the matter of education, the United States stands dishonored beside Canada. Though a province of England, which has an established Church, Canada fosters impartially the missions of all denominations with no unjust discrimination, and has never openly or by any subterfuge attempted to break up the Catholic missions. She has solved, too, the question of education, and of the religious needs of inmates of eleemosynary and penal institutions, so as to give full satisfaction to all; and the State is a State, not a department of a proselytizing society. In the British Provinces, New Brunswick alone, affected by a New England neighbor, doubtless, has copied a page from the conduct of this country.

The great civil war in the United States, was one produced by a state of feeling that Protestant clergy had fanned. Before it began Archbishop Hughes wrote, speaking of the Catholic body: "They take but an abstemious part in the great questions which have threatened the disruption of the country. They have entire confidence that the general wisdom and patriotism of the American people will be quite sufficient to preserve the Constitution and Union of the United States." Thus far it stands in print; but in his original copy he added: "If, unhappily, an event which is sometimes alluded to as a possible contingency—namely, a division of the country—should ever take place, the Catholics will have had no voluntary part in bringing about such a calamity. We trust that it will never occur. Should it ever unfortunately happen, it will not be by their co-operation." And what he said of the division, is true of the war. They had no hand in producing it. The Catholics in each section bore their part with their fellow citizens. North and South Catholic chaplains faced the dangers of the battle field, and Catholic Sisters tended the couches of the sick and wounded, as calmly and as nobly as they had faced the cholera, the typhus or yellow fever. Archbishop Hughes, like the first American Bishop, was an envoy of our government, and did efficient service in Europe. The Pope, when addressed by the President of the seceding States, counselled peace, and like many a Pope of old, proffered his services to restore harmony.

In the desolating path of contending armies, many Catholic churches and institutions were swept away: sometimes the desecration and destruction were wanton, sometimes unavoidable. The close of the war found the Catholic Church in the Southern States more disastrously situated than any other; and the misgovernment which has followed, has involved them still more. But with zeal unchecked she has, with the new freedom, begun her labors among the negro race; and as a Church which makes no distinction of color, but reveres, as saints, the negro Saint Benedict, and the mulatto Blessed Martin de Porras, she sees her success limited only by her limited number of missionaries to devote to the work.

In the North we are now feeling the result of the war, and of the impoverishment of the South. In the prostration of commerce, and the stagnation produced by excessive taxation and the results of inflation, emigration has fallen off greatly; and the Catholic body gains now mainly by natural increase. But the persecution of the Church in Germany has driven to our shores many excellent priests, secular and regular, and members of religious orders of women, who increase greatly the power to minister to the Catholic body. All do not reach us. Some, like the Franciscan nuns on the Deutschland, meet their death on the ocean, more nobly and bravely, than Bismarck or his imperial master will.

The civil war absorbed the public mind too much to allow the regular decennial campaign against the Catholics. Many of the Protestant clergy were drawn away by it to more lucrative positions, so that the necessity for it was not felt. But the ten years since the close of the war find all ripe for it. Yet the present campaign against the Church has some peculiar features. It is not Protestant so much as Methodist.

All our Presidents have been Protestants; several Episcopalians, some Presbyterians, Congregationalist, Reformed Dutch, Unitarian; yet no one ever felt that they were Presbyterian or Episcopalian, or even Protestant. The religion of the President was unthought of. Few even could tell to what denomination Mr. Fillmore belonged, though as ex-President he was nominated as a distinctively Protestant candidate by the Native Americans.

But with the advent of President Grant to the Presidential chair it has been different. That he is a Methodist is kept constantly before the public mind. He is actually priest-ridden. The bishops and ministers of his creed exercise an influence, that the Presbyterians never dreamed of coveting, while Jackson or Polk were in power; or Episcopalians under Washington, Madison or Monroe. Methodist influence prevails throughout. The Methodists, in the division of superintendencies and agencies, did not find that the poorest or leanest fell to their lot; and new employments like that of inspecting consulates were devised for Methodist clergymen, with secretaryships for their wives. Perhaps to blind the other Protestant denominations to this, they raised the war cry against Popery. Harper's Weekly began the campaign, and that old Methodist firm kept up its attacks long before the press of the Protestant denominations had begun to move, or before the Protestant clergy in pulpit or conventions showed any inclination to begin an anti-Catholic excitement. They have been ultimately led in; but the movement arose with the Methodists, who have at last crowned all by nominating General Grant for the third term, and doing this as part of the business of a religious convention.

Other denominations will resent this, or will bide their time and follow the same course; and America will in future see a series of priest-ridden administrations, according to the denomination to which the actual chief magistrate belongs.

As part of the programme, President Grant, in his Message of December, 1875, urges an amendment to the constitution, which shall compel all states to adopt a public school system, to forbid all "religious, atheistic or pagan" instruction in them, and to prevent hereafter all division of the school moneys among denominations according to the old New York system. It uses the undefined word sectarian, in the usual treacherous way; it being understood among the initiated that nothing Protestant is sectarian, and that everything Catholic is.

To use a homely simile, they would maintain that if a Catholic were, in disputing about this question, to be drubbed soundly by a Methodist, it would be a sectarian drubbing; but that if a Methodist, a Presbyterian, a Baptist, and representatives of half a dozen other sects, all set upon him at once, it would be a non-sectarian drubbing. We must confess that we should consider it as intensely sectarian as there were sects engaged in it, and sectarian precisely to that degree.

The President also recommends an amendment to compel States to tax Church property. This step, too, was aimed at the Catholics. The burthens of the late war have made people seek all means to relieve themselves, and especially by abolishing all exemptions. In New Jersey, in 1875, an amendment to this end was proposed. Bishop Corrigan, of Newark, in a circular, called the attention of Catholics to it, and urged them to vote against it as a measure as yet uncalled for, and intended to be oppressive. A strong anti-Catholic feeling was excited; the amendment was passed by a very large majority; and now the various Protestant denominations are organizing to appeal to the legislature for relief. Like unskilled men, they hurled the boomerang only to wound themselves.

It is by no means unlikely, that in the decennial madness to which the nation is subject, amendments, such as the President suggests, may pass through Congress, and obtain from a majority such a sanction as will make them part of the organic law of the land; or, it may prove, that some States will hesitate to put out of their hands all future power to administer local concerns according to the better judgment of the people. New York, for instance, may hesitate to place herself in such a position, that she can never revive a system under which education prospered, and religious animosity was unknown; she may, rather than keep up a deep-seated and indignant protest against an ill administered system, wish herself free, when she chooses to adopt the course which Canada finds so satisfactory. She may read the motto on her old coins, "Liber natus libertatem defendo," and decline the invitation of the President to surrender irrevocably her power to adapt her educational system to the wants of the people.

The amendment proposed by the President puts religion on a level with atheism, and would scarcely meet the desires of the fanatical; the amendment introduced by Speaker Blaine has all the insidious cunning of the small politician. It is so worded that Protestant doctrines may be taught in the schools with impunity; but no Catholic doctrine ever can be. It will put the broad seal of the United States to proselytism, and make us the great *Souper* country of the world.

The recommendation to tax Church property was based, in the message, on statistics which are absolutely false, even as the figures are officially given; and in regard to Catholics these official figures are really fraudulent. Churches, schools, academies, asylums, are all included in the Catholic figures; but many colleges in the country, distinctly and avowedly under the direction of separate Protestant denominations, are not so counted. Moreover, there is a class of institutions such as the Bible Society, the A. B. C. F. Mission, the Tract Societies, the Society for Propagating the Gospel, and others of the kind, whose property would reach millions, which are not, of course, charged to any Protestant denomination, but should be added to the sum of the different Protestant denominations.

The Centennial year thus announces to Catholics a two-fold attack: one that will make the obtaining of justice in regard to the schools impossible; the other that will endeavor to crush their churches, or confiscate them, every generation.

And in the population of forty millions, over which this chief magistrate presides, what is the Catholic body? A community numbering more than six millions, with a Cardinal Archbishop, and ten other archbishops, fifty-six bishops, 5,074 priests, 5,046 churches, with nearly two thousand schools, besides colleges, academies and high schools, and more than three hundred hospitals and refuges for the afflicted. It was shown on an examination, not prompted by them, that these eleemosynary institutions are conducted with the greatest order and effectiveness, yet at a percentage of expense for management that is marvelously small compared to that which obtains in most others, either state or denominational, in many of which officials obtain really more, than the objects for whom the money is given. The same holds true of the schools. In an age of extravagance, and in a reign of government extravagance, nothing can exceed the lavish extravagance in the outlay of money for public schools. It is no exaggeration to say, that, in many parts, the Catholic schools, educate the young so well as to compete without fear with the state schools, and yet at a cost to them not exceeding one-third, what each scholar in the state schools costs the state.

We have seen what the Church was in 1845, and what it is in 1876. The progress has not been merely in numbers. The general effect of a more numerous clergy has enabled new Religious from abroad or formed among us to become auxiliaries to the secular clergy in their parochial work. The retreats and missions, initiated, we may say, by Bishop Forbon Janson, have become general, and the lack of direct instruction in many cases is supplied by these exercises, given by Redemptorists, Jesuits, Paulists, Passionists, Dominicans—reviving faith, arousing the torpid, strengthening the wavering. The increase and diffusion of Catholic works has been very great, and is no longer confined to reprints and translations, but shows, constantly, accessions of books of piety and instruction, suited in language and thought to the time and country; for though truth is always the same, the objections to it differ, and many of the arguments and defenses in our older works are almost unintelligible, as they were framed to meet objections no longer raised, suppose our opponents to believe truths they have long since discarded, and have no reference to the now prevailing indifference to all definite religious thought.

With the increase of schools has come a vast improvement in school books; and those now prepared for Catholic schools are in many cases equal to any found in the country in their general beauty and workmanship, while in correct thought they are superior. These schools, too, have led to the suppression of much offensive matter in the ordinary school books of the day, where they had crept from bigotry or sheer ignorance. The calm, patient attitude of the Catholics has in these points effected reform; their attitude in regard to the vital point has been the same. Feeling as they do, deeply, that the present school system, as actually administered, is unjust, oppressive and unconstitutional, they have held no meetings, begun no agitation; they have neither petitioned legislatures, nor appealed to the courts. They have submitted to injustice, and quietly made sacrifices to do for themselves what government takes money from them to do, but does not. All the agiation, all the declamation, all the constitution-tinkering, is the work of the very men who have caused this deep injustice to be committed against the Catholics.

To secure freedom of worship for Catholics in penal and eleemosynary institutions, has been a great object. Several States have already placed Catholics nearly in the same position that England has done for years; other States still think it part of their duty to deprive Catholic inmates of all the worship and sacraments of their Church, and to compel them to listen to Protestant ministers. As it has not been proposed to make this course peremptory, by altering the Constitution of the United States to meet the case, we may hope that what George Washington, President of the United States, wrote, may yet come true, even in New Jersey: "As mankind become more liberal, they will be more apt to allow that all those who conduct themselves as worthy members of the community, are equally entitled to the protection of the civil government." "I hope," he added, "ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality; and I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their revolution, and the establishment of their goverenment, or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed."

We have thus sketched the exterior rather than the interior life of the Church since its first appearance in America to this day, and especially the origin and influence of the campaigns against her during the last forty years, and the various pretexts on which her enemies have relied.

She has had in this century her bright examples of virtue and sanctity, in such of her children as Bishop Cheverus, Prince Galitzin, Bishop Flaget, Mrs. Seton, Miss Lalor, Rev. Mr. Nerinckx, Bishop David, Archbishop Neale, and many whose names are less familiar; her ardent missionaries in Father De Smet, Bishop Baraga, Archbishop Blanchet; her martyrs in the hundreds of priests and religious, who have laid down their lives ministering to the sick and wounded, when pestilence stalked abroad, and all fled from the stricken; she has her writers taught in the school of persecution to be honest and fearless, and who have so often passed through unjust accusation that they can be just to others amid a general excitement, as was the case when the son of an old enemy of the Catholics found, in his hour of trial, a solace in Catholic fairness, when Protestants almost denied him a hearing. She has her regular Councils, Provincial, or embracing the whole country, forming her body of Canon law, full of wisdom and instinct with the spirit of the best ages of the Church.

Here the Church has shown her inherent vitality. Composed of heterogeneous material, "of devout men from every nation under heaven," she blends them all into one body of American Catholics, attached to the country, making its prosperity their own, and ready to share its trials. In all she keeps alive the higher religious life, the desire to seek first the kingdom of God and His justice; and evolving from this her countless forms of devotion, the highest that of self-consecration to the entire service of God, in some of those religious communities which are the rich flowers in her garden. There is nothing, in this life or this vitality, that can do aught but tend to the greater good of the whole country; and the country, when not blinded as she is sometimes for a moment, attests this by the instinct, which in every case has impelled her, almost at once, to discard with scorn the decennial fanatics.

The Catholic Church, first to plant the cross on our soil; first to bedew it with the blood of martyrs; first to offer on it the Christian sacrifice and administer the Christian sacraments, has a great mission before her. Persecution she expects, injustice and oppression: these are not new to her. She sees in them the tokens of approval. "The Lord gave, the Lord hath taken away." This will not deter her from her path; they will but strengthen and unite. As things are now tending around us, in the decline of morals and religion, the substitution of secret societies for churches, in the war of natural science on faith, it is not rash to assert, that, fifty years hence, the Catholic Church will be on this soil almost the only compact Christian body, battling for the Scriptures and the revealed Word of God, or recognizing Him as the Creator and moral Governor of the Universe, a rallying point for all who shall claim to be Christians.

JOHN GILMARY SHEA.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE INTERNAL MISSION OF THE HOLY GHOST. By His Eminence, *Henry Edward Manning*, Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Third Edition. New York: D. & J. Sadlier & Co., 31 Barclay St. Montreal: 275 Notre Dame St. 1875.

We call attention to this work, not to criticise it, but to express, however feebly, our admiration of it, and to commend it to the careful and devout perusal of such of our readers as may not have yet read it. What must strike every one at all familiar with the writings of the illustrious Archbishop of Westminster, is, their practical bearing on the life and thought of the present time. He had studied his age as few other men have studied it. He has carefully observed the workings of the mystery of iniquity under its manifold forms, in modern society, outside the church, and within her fold. He is intimately acquainted with the doctrinal, moral, and social errors and evils of the day. He knows them in themselves, in their causes, and in their effects. He has traced their more recent and alarming developments, such as Cæsarism, socialism, and materialism, to their first beginning, which was the rebellion of the intellect and the will against God, in the individual, and in society, especially at the time of the great apostasy of the sixteenth century. He has described in eloquent words the evils already caused by that apostasy, and the still greater evils likely to follow from it in the not distant future. He has done this, not once, but time and again, and in a variety of ways. He has done it in sermons, in pastorals, in letters, in speeches, in essays, and in books, always in the graceful style so peculiarly his own, with the frank courtesy of an English gentleman, but with the boldness, too, of a Christian bishop. There is no bitterness in his polemics. Intolerant of error, he is full of charity for the erring, especially those whose ignorance may be presumed to be invincible, of whom, he thinks, there is a very large class in England.

"I do not," he says, "charge all those who are out of the unity of the Catholic faith, with heresy. The English people are indeed in heresy, but I do not call them heretics. God forbid! They were born into that state of privation. They found themselves disinherited. They have never known their rightful inheritance. They have grown up believing what has been set before them by parents and by teachers; their state of privation has been caused by the sin of others, three hundred years ago, and by no act of rejection of their own. The millions of our people, the children, the unlearned, the simple, the docile, the humble, the wives and mothers and daughters, the great multitude who live lives of prayer, and of charity, and of mutual kindness, who never had an opportunity of knowing the truth—to call them heretics would be to wound charity. They have never made a perverse election against the truth, and I heartily believe that millions of them, if the light of the Catholic Church were sufficiently before them, would, as multitudes have done in every age, forsake all things to take up their cross and follow their Master."

But the Archbishop has not merely enumerated and described, in the manner already mentioned, the errors and the evils that afflict modern society; he has, with equal zeal and eloquence, pointed out the means by which they may be prevented or overcome. As regards those who are without, they must return to God. "There is no other hope. There is nothing but God on which the soul can rest, on which society can stand. The most perfect legislation, the most refined human laws, the most acute human philosophy, political economy, benevolence, and beneficence in all its forms, all the social sciences of which we hear so much—all these are powerless without God. * * * * Neither adults nor children can be touched by the laws of states, except externally. The state may control the external actions of man—it can imprison, it can fine, it can inflict capital punishment; but it cannot convert the sinner, nor change the will, nor illuminate the intellect, nor guide the conscience, nor shape a character. All this is internal, not external; it is not mechanism, it belongs to the living power of the soul; and God alone, by truth and grace, can accomplish this work in man." They must withdraw from "the revolt which begins with the rejection of the Divine authority of the Church of God, and then goes on to reject evidences, next to reject doctrines, and lastly to reject Christianity."

As to Catholics, he has told them, in season and out of season, how they may guard themselves against the evil spirit that is abroad and around them in the world at the present time. In the volume before us, he seeks to impress upon them the duty of special wisdom to the Holy Ghost, which he thinks particularly necessary in these days. In a previous work published ten years ago, and now republished by the Messrs. Sadlier & Co., he explained the temporal mission of the Holy Ghost, that is, His union with and His operation in the Church, from the day of Pentecost. He therein showed how, by this union, the Church necessarily receives a communication of the perfections of this Holy Spirit; how it is made imperishable, because He is God; indivisibly one, because He is numerically one; holy, because He is the fountain of holiness; infallible, because He is the truth, and receives all the other endowments that make it a safe and authoritative guide in all that relates to faith and morals. The present volume, the author tells us, deals with the universal office of the Holy Ghost, in the souls of individual men, before as well as since the day of Pentecost: "Every living soul has an illumination of God, in the order of nature, by the light of conscience, and by the light of reason, and by the working of the Spirit of God in his head and in his heart, leading him to believe in God, and to obey Him." The presence of the Holy Ghost in the souls of the just, is the source of their sanctification; "He perpetually pervades their intellect with the light of faith, and their heart by the working of charity, and their will by the inspiration of His own; and from this spring the growth and ripeness of faith, hope, and charity, which we receive in our Baptism." This "ripeness" is accelerated by the "Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost," and, perfected by the "Eight Beatitudes;" which last constitute the highest perfections of the saints, and give them a fore-taste of the joys that are in store for them.

This brief outline gives an idea, but only an idea of the object or argument of the present work. To be rightly appreciated, the work itself must be carefully read and studied. It is eminently calculated to promote the object the distinguished author had in view in writing it; for, how can we be made to understand, as it gives us clearly to understand, that to the Holy Ghost we are immediately indebted for all that is beautiful in holiness, for all that is admirable in virtue, for all that elevates, and purifies, and adorns our fallen nature, and not feel our devotion to Him increase from day to day? The author is necessarily led to touch on some very difficult points of dogmatic theology; but he does so only in so far as is necessary to furnish convincing motives of action to the Catholic conscience. His treatment of them, however, is remarkable for a clearness and an accuracy, for a beauty of style, and a fitness and force of illustration, to be found in very few writers. Take as examples of the striking Appositeness of his illustrations the three following extracts, with which we close our too brief notice of this most interesting book. The first refers to the action of grace and free will; the second, to the grace of final perseverance; and the last to the manifestation and development of the supernatural habits infused into the infant soul in Baptism.

"But, as I have already said, the grace of God co-operates with us, or works with us. I cannot make this clearer than by putting before you, what I cannot doubt, most of you have seen. You have seen a lock in a river, and you have watched how, when the lock is shut, the water rises against the gate. It presses with its full weight against the gate, until a hand—it may be the hand of a child, with such facility it is accomplished—opens the gate of the lock; at once the flood pours in, the level of the water rises, the stream runs strong, and carries forward those that float upon it, almost without effort of their own. The grace of God, that is, the power of the Holy Ghost, is always pressing against our will, always in contact with our heart, moving us onward towards God, impelling us to good. And this pressure of the Holy Ghost against our will, waits only for our will to open: 'Behold I stand at the gate and knock. If any man shall hear My voice and open the door, I will go in to him and sup with him, and he with Me.' The Holy Spirit of God is waiting at the door all the day long; in every action we do, He is pressing upon our will to make us do good, and when we are doing good, to make us do better. But he waits for our will to correspond. He never forces it. The will must be willing. If we only open the gate, the full tide of His grace will flow in, and uniting itself with all our powers, will elevate our personal will above itself, strengthen it with supernatural force, and carry it onward with facility and speed."

"Perseverance is a gift of God. It comes from His sovereign grace and He gives it to those who co-operate with him; and on them He bestows it, as a free grace of His love. You know that if we were to shoot a thousand arrows at a mark, every arrow might hit that mark; it is physically possible. There is nothing to hinder such a feat. But we know, with a perfect certainty, that out of that thousand arrows many will never strike the mark; they will fall short, or go beyond, or swerve on either side. And why? Because that which is physically possible is defeated by some infirmity, either of the eye, or of the hand, or of our posture, or of our poise and balance, or something in the bow or in the string, or it is a current in the wind, or some undetected flaw in the circumstances of the action. Any one of these will divert the arrow's flight. So it is in all our moral life. That which we may do is often not done. It fails through our own defects. God indeed gives us sufficient grace to fulfil what is necessary for our salvation; and though it is possible for us never to fail, it is perfectly certain that in many things we shall fail. If, then, there were not a special grace of God watching over and taking up His work in us, it would fall from our hands. Through our weakness it never would be made perfect."

"The act of belief contains in it a light of the Holy Spirit of God, illuminating the reason, moving the will and kindling in the heart a love of the truth. This grace, which God gave in measure throughout the whole world before the Incarnation, He gives now in fullness to every regenerate child. It is given in baptism by the infusion of grace into the soul. Faith, hope and charity are infused into the soul of every baptized infant. As by nature every human soul has reason and memory and will, which three faculties are implanted in the soul by its creation, so faith, hope and charity are infused into the soul in regeneration by supernatural grace. They, thenceforward, reside in the soul, and as we call an infant a rational being because by nature it possesses reason, so we count a baptized infant one of the faithful because it possesses the infused virtue of faith. And this grace of faith, which is in us from our regeneration, is developed by exercise, just as the reason, which we have from our birth, is developed by culture. And, as the whole power of numbers lies potentially in the reason of a child as fire lies in a flint, needing only to be elicited, so in the soul of a regenerate child there is the power of faith, which needs only instruction and exercise to unfold it."

ESSAYS on various Subjects. By His Eminence *Cardinal Wiseman*. In six volumes. New York: P. O'Shea, 37 Barclay street.

Though these Essays of Cardinal Wiseman are, as their title states, on various subjects, still they are not without a certain general bond of unity. Thus the first portion (vols. 1 and 2) is devoted exclusively to the Bible and to the Church in her doctrines or liturgy. In it, amongst other things, the important text of the "Three Heavenly Witnesses" is discussed, in order to show that the rejection of the passage is not called for by sufficient reasons of Biblical criticism. Another essay calls attention to the defects of our present English Catholic Version, which needs to be revised once more, so as to rid it of some of Bishop Challoner's "corrections and improvements," which are such only in name, not in reality: and the principles are laid down which should guide whoever undertakes such revision. In three other copious essays the author, with the magical key of genius and erudition, unlocks the hidden meaning of the Parables, Miracles and Actions of the New Testament; and proves that the attempts of heretical or merely critical interpreters may avail to illustrate the *dead letter*, but are powerless to search out the *spirit* of the Gospel history. How could it be otherwise? If the Catholic Church be, as we know she is, the church of the Gospel and of the Apostles, it is little short of madness to investigate their writings, without bearing in mind and holding in due reverence *her* dogmas and traditions. Then follow the celebrated Letters to Mr. Poynder on his "Alliance between Paganism and Popery," a fine specimen of the Cardinal's pleasant, caustic style; and other papers, among which those on the Fate of Sacrilege, National Holidays and the "Minor Rites and Offices of the Church," deserve special attention.

The next portion (vols. 3 and 4) may lay special claim to unity and continuity of thought. For, it is taken up with one main subject, treated under a variety of forms, namely, the movement against the State Religion of the English Church, which originated in Oxford some fifty years ago. One of the motives which induced Cardinal (then Dr.) Wiseman to connect himself with the *Dublin Review*, and to undertake the control of its Theological Department, was his desire to influence, as far as a Catholic could, the movement for the benefit of religion in England. It was his aim to watch the progress of the rising stream, to encourage or check by timely words of approval or warning its onward course; and finally, if possible, to guide its waters into the channel of Catholic Truth. He may not have accomplished all that his enthusiasm led him to expect; but he was eminently successful. And his example teaches us how far more efficacious are peaceful, earnest words, than the angry wielding of the controversial sword. All that could reasonably be expected, came to happen in due time. Those, who were quite willing to "discern and approve the best," but would go no farther—when the decisive moment came—refused to look upon the Grace that beckoned them onward, preferred the honor and friendship of this world to the profession of truth and the welfare of their souls, and sank at last, some into the mire of that narrow, vulgar, every-day Protestantism they had once talked of so scornfully, others into the abyss of skepticism. Our own country has furnished the like experience. Their leader, Pusey, from whom the school takes its name, is one of those who has most misused the light given him; and, without a miracle of grace, his final persistence in error seems a foregone conclusion. Instead of drawing nearer to the Catholic Church, as some had hoped, he has steadily grown to hate her more and more; and, whenever it is expedient to blacken her character, he can stoop to falsehood and calumny as readily as the lowest disciples of John Knox or Calvin, on whom he affects to look down with such lofty disdain. He exercises a mean, petty tyranny (this we know for certain) over his followers, lay and clerical, such as no English Catholic would endure at the hands of the True Pontiff, were he *per impossibile* to attempt its exercise. He reminds us

Si parva licet componere magnis

of Melanchthon, who attempted to step into the shoes of the defunct Pope of Wittemberg, and thereby incurred the hatred and scorn of Flacius, Osiander and other Protestants. History affords no example, we believe, to show that the founder and head of any school of heresy (and the Oxford school was such, in spite of its many sound principles and praiseworthy aspirations), who ever had the happiness to be reconciled to the Catholic Church. And John Henry Newman, a name honored and revered throughout all Christendom, may thank God from the bottom of his heart, that—though he was once the life and soul, and brightest ornament of that new school—happily it never acknowledged him as its leader, nor inherited his name. Otherwise, it is very possible, to say the least, that he would never have had the good fortune to subdue the natural pride of intellect, and humble it with child-like obedience, as he has done, at the feet of Christ and His Church. But though the corypheus of the sect and many of his disciples have sunk to lower depths, yet many, very many of them were true to themselves and obedient to the call of grace. They abandoned kindred, friends, life-long associations, worldly position, and everything else, to hear and obey Him, who is "the Way, the Truth and the Life." And incalculable good has come of these conversions to the Catholic Church in England. They have furnished scores of priests for the destitute missions, and their conversion has led to that of many others among their kinsmen, their friends, their former parishioners. And all this, thank God! has produced an influence, that permeates and silently works upon the middle, the lower, and the highest classes of English society, especially upon the two last mentioned.

The third part (vols. 5 and 6), are simply miscellaneous in their character, and amply show the varied range of the Cardinal's knowledge. He seems to be perfect master of every subject, from the sewers of London and the science of drainage, to the mysteries of painting, ancient art, and the most recondite points of archæology.

Mr. O'Shea, the publisher, has done his part well in getting up these handsome volumes, which form only a portion of the entire Works of the illustrious Cardinal, which he intends to give to the public.

Life of the Apostle St. John. By *M. L. Baunard.* Translated from the first French edition. New York: The Catholic Publication Society, No. 9 Warren St. 1875. 8 vo., pp. 417.

The appearance of this book may excite a feeling of surprise, that some one has not given us long ago a life of the Beloved Apostle, for whose personal history there existed such good material in the pages of Scripture and of early Church history. Perhaps this attempt, and its success, may prompt some of our Catholic scholars (we think no Protestant would or should attempt it) to give us a life of St. Peter, written in the same spirit and somewhat after the same pattern. And there is no reason, why the same might not be attempted in the case of St. James, the third who enjoyed our Saviour's closer intimacy, the Apostle of Hope (as the other two were of Faith and Charity), the Apostle and Patron of a land that is great and lordly, even in the present abasement and misery—even though critical sources may not prove as abundant as in the case of St. Peter and of St. John.

Of the author of the book before us, beyond his name, we know nothing, except that he is a French priest of the diocese of Orleans, and that the first edition was published by Poupilgue at Paris, in the latter half of 1869, under the title of "L' Apôtre St. Jean." And it would have been no harm to advise the general reader of this much, in a few words prefixed to the volume. The translator does not disclose his name; but he has done his part well and faithfully, rendering the text of his Author into good, idiomatic English (a few peculiarities make us suspect he was born south of Mason and Dixon's line, which is no fault); and it is seldom, indeed, we are reminded of the fact, that the original is so thoroughly French as to color even the translation.

The author, M. l' Abbe Baunard, as he tells us in his Preface, conceived the idea of writing this book, while he was quietly meditating and praying in the magnificent cathedral of Rome, the Church of St. John of Lateran. The reflection that, while the cathedral, so to call it, of the Universal Pontiff derived its name from St. Peter, the true cathedral of the Bishop of Rome, from which title flows all his power as Bishop of Bishops, was dedicated to St. John—struck him as something wonderful and charming in Roman symbolism. The voice, so we interpret the author's meaning, with which Rome enchains the obedience of the world, is the voice of Peter, the Apostle of Faith; but the heart, which prompts these utterances, is the heart of John, the Apostle of Love. Within immediate sight of him who looks forth from the Lateran portico, distant not more than a stone's throw, stands the Scala Santa, up the steps of which John had watched the toilsome ascent of his beloved Master; a little farther off rise the fair proportions of Santa Croce, the noble Sessorian Basilica, which recalls all the memories of the Passion and Crucifixion, at which John assisted; and between the city gate, which bears his name, in front of the Lateran, and the Porta Capena, a little to the east of the latter, one may descry the Latin gate, near which John lovingly, but in vain, strove to win the martyr's purple crown. No wonder that this scene inspired the good priest, and that these hallowed memories, rushing upon his soul, impelled him to consecrate his pen to the praises of the glorious Apostle. And he has written of him with love and enthusiasm. He follows the Saint from his birth, through his apostolic career, up to the day of his death in Ephesus. He indulges, it must be said to his credit, in precisely the amount of auxiliary erudition that will entertain and gratify the reader—enough to illustrate without overwhelming his subject. The character he seeks to give of the saintly Apostle is real and historical; not that which is too often presented to the fancy by painting and legend. He does not place him before us, as these generally represent him, as the mere "type of inert and languid tenderness." Against this error he protests from the very beginning of his work:

"We remember that John styles himself the beloved disciple; we too readily forget that Jesus named him 'the Son of Thunder.' We willingly recognize in him the Evangelist of the Lamb; we forget that that Lamb was the heroic Victim, and that to love Him is to follow Him even to immolation. We remember that John demanded a place of honor at the right hand of his King; we forget that even then he engaged to drink of His chalice of bitterness, and that he kept his word. We see him at the Last Supper leaning on the bosom of Jesus; we do not sufficiently contemplate him standing upright upon Calvary and at the foot of the cross. Let us not misunderstand it; the love which John represents are the supernatural energies of the passion, of which he himself says, 'Fear is not in charity; but perfect charity casteth out fear.'"—Pref. pp. 13–14.

Here is another passage, which will give our readers some further idea of the author's style:

"The 'Spiritual Gospel,' in order to be understood, demanded elevated souls, and therefore he addresses it to Christian souls. It requires to be 'born of God,' as he himself explains it, to enter into the divine mystery of the Gospel. The expression which St. John employed to signify that initiation, that divine regeneration, was *unction, chrisma.* 'As for you, let the unction, which you have received from Him, abide in you.' You have received the unction from the Holy One and know all things." (1. John, ii: 20–27). An exterior unction, in fact, consecrated the Christian in baptism. But that was but the emblem of a spiritual unction, far otherwise profound, which was to become the sign of the new nation. The fragrant perfumes, which the Asiatics showered upon themselves; the oil which athletes rubbed upon their limbs; that which lent men its brightness during the night; the anointing of prophets, of priests and of kings; beauty, strength, consecration and light, were all contained in that rich image. But especially it recalled in its very root the sacred name of Christ. It was Christianity itself, in the historic and etymologic sense, which received that deposit of the Gospel of St. John, with the double precept of keeping it in her heart and of disseminating it throughout the world." Pp. 331–2.

We might, perhaps, object to a word, which occurs in a note on page 36, where St. John Chrysostom is alleged as calling the Apostle "an utter ignoramus." The translator's expression does not seem happily chosen, and we think the author, too, has misconceived, or exaggerated, at least, St. Chrysostom's meaning. Whatever the saint has said, is based upon the passage of St. Luke (Acts iv: 13); and he must not be supposed to go beyond his authority. Moreover he was well acquainted with the meaning of the two Greek words *αγραμματοι* and *ιδιωται* used by St. Luke, and would not push them beyond their legitimate sense in the inspired writing. Now, these words do not mean "unlettered and ignorant," as they appear in Challoner's modern recension of the Douay and in King James' Bible, but "unlettered men and of the vulgar sort," as the old Douay and Bishop Kenrick translate. Even the two French versions most in use, the Catholic (we may call it so for the present,) of Le Maistre de Sacy, and the Calvinistic of Ostervald, render the passage correctly, "des hommes sans lettres et du commun du peuple." And we are astonished that Father Amelotte and the paraphrastic version of F. Carriere have ventured to render it otherwise.

Again, on page 41, Venerable Bede is introduced as *constructing a fable*, out of some words of St. Augustine (Joannem Dominus de fluctivaga nuptiarum tempestate vocavit), which he failed to understand. Now, passing over the fact that these words are not St. Augustine's, the censure of the great English Saint and Doctor, we think, ought to have been more mildly expressed, for more reasons than one. In the first place there is nothing in Venerable Bede's words that really detracts from the glory of St. John, nor does his phrase, given by our author (Ibid.) "castus permansit," in any real sense contradict A. Lapide's gloss on the words of Pseudo-Augustine (whoever he may have been), or that beautiful passage of the liturgy, "virgo electus ab Ipso, virgo in aevum permansit?" We think not; besides, the opinion of Bede was held also by the Angel of the Schools, St. Thomas of Aquin, and by others. (V. Sandini Hist. Familiae Sacrae, cap. x., 65, and his Historia Apostol. de S. Joanne, 2, 3. See also Benedict XIV. De Beatif. et Canonizat. Sanctorum, Lib. III. cap. 37.) But nothing could be farther from our intention, in making these passing remarks, than to detract in the least from this admirable book, so full of instruction and edification.

"CONFESSION, by *Monseigneur de Segur.* Translated from the French by the Sisters of Charity, New Haven, Connecticut. New York. P. O'Shea: 37 Barclay street, and 42 Park Place. 1875."

This is a charming popular tract on auricular confession. At the outset, the Monseigneur "button-holes" his reader, and talks to him, all through it, with the easy grace of a witty but a wise Frenchman. It is addressed to the average free-thinking Catholic among his countrymen, whose head is wrong because his heart is more or less corrupt. It is clear, yet profound; and though necessarily short, it leaves very little to be said on the subject of which it treats. It is about the very best answer we have seen to popular objections against confession, and it will be found most useful in preparing the young to meet those objections, and in enlightening non-Catholic acquaintance in regard to the origin and the effects of the sacrament of Penance. As a specimen of the author's style we give the following answer to the objection: "I don't want the priest to interfere with my affairs." "Unfortunately, God wills such interference, and we must submit to it. Your affairs, my friend, are the priest's affairs, inasmuch as they concern the service of God and the affairs of your conscience. Our Lord Jesus Christ expressly charged his priests to concern themselves in such affairs. And, therefore, does not the priest interfere only with your affairs of conscience, leaving you to yourself in all things not pertaining to religion? The priest has not only a right, but a duty, a rigorous duty: First, to teach you, in general, and in particular, what you ought to do, and what to avoid, what is good and what evil, what is permitted and what forbidden; and after having taught you, he must, secondly, by every means, even at the risk of tiring and annoying you, excite you to serve God faithfully, and avoid, in your household affairs, in your business transactions, &c., all that is forbidden by the Sovereign Master, who alone is God.

"I can conceive that it would often be more agreeable not to have the eye and voice of the priest to fear, and sometimes we would willingly dispense with his interference; but it is just at such time precisely we most need him. Thus the young scamp who runs the street or the field, steals fruit and plays all sorts of tricks when he ought to be in school; the collegian who reads bad books, who stirs up cabals, who does all he ought not to do, and nothing of what he ought to accomplish; the honest grocer, who purloins from all he sells, and practices slight of hand on his scales; the amiable young man seeking to seduce the poor working girl; the servant man or woman who makes profit on his or her master's marketing; the sturdy wine merchant, friend of logwood, who carries his devotion so far as to baptize and rebaptize the contents of his barrels; the great lawyer who cheats half his clients, and the small one who cheats them all; the stout solicitor, father of quibbles and inventor of cases; the selfish housekeeper who forgets the poor and her duty of alms-giving; the woman of the world who permits unlawful admiration and reconciles such conduct with her conscience, &c., &c.—all these, you may be sure, repeat in concert, I do not want the priest to interfere in my affairs! The upright, on the contrary, and good Christians, find only their advantage in confession; they are happy to have, in the priest, a firm support, a faithful counsellor, a disinterested friend, who guides them into the good path, and enables them to penetrate the folds of their conscience. When a son says to his father, 'I do not want people to meddle with my affairs,' it is a bad sign—not for the father, but for the son; and experience shows that in such cases there is always '*a snake in the grass.*'"

OFFICIUM PARVUM BEATAE MARIAE VIRGINIS Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary. According to the Roman Ritual. (Latin and English.) Baltimore: Kelly, Piet & Co., 1875.

The Little Office of Our Lady has ever been a favorite devotion in the Catholic Church. It was the comfort of our fathers in the days of persecution, and relieved the horrors of many a gloomy cell, when allegiance to the Catholic Church was punished as a crime against the State. It is yet, in most Catholic countries, in constant use with the devout laity, and those clerics who are not yet bound to recite the Divine office. It is well to propagate such devotion amongst our own laity, that they may not forget God and their souls in this worldly, money-making generation. St. Paul (Eph. v. 19,) and St. James (v. 13,) recommend psalmody to laymen, no less than to priests.

The Latin text in the book before us is taken, as it should be, from the Vulgate; but the English translation of the Psalms and Canticles, where did it come from? not from the Douay, nor from King James' Bible. The translator seems to be one of the eclectic school, and to have made use of one or the other just as it suited him, though giving the preference rather to the Anglican version. We might object to this on purely critical grounds; and ask the translator, for example, why he has preferred "brook" to "torrent" in the last verse of Psalm cix. No one who has any knowledge of the physical geography of the Holy Land, can be ignorant that the Hebrew "Nahhal" is not a "brook" as King James' translators improperly call it, but a "torrent" as the Vulgate and our old Douay render it. But now and again our interpreter rejects both the Catholic and Protestant rendering of certain passages, and gives an interpretation of his own. From this it might probably be conjectured that this translation was prepared for some edition of the Office printed for the use of Catholics in England or Ireland over a hundred years ago, at a time when the old Douay was going out of date, and Bp. Challoner's revised edition (1750) had not yet made its way into public favor and general use. Hence the translator conceived himself at liberty to use any of the existing versions, or to make one of his own. Whenever he has taken the latter course, we do not think that he has always improved upon his predecessors; nor is he to be blamed for it; for the task of a translator of Scripture, and especially of the Psalms, is no easy one. But it is not to the fidelity or merits of the translation, that we are now objecting. We look to higher considerations. No one doubts that it is lawful, *servatis servandis*, for any Catholic theologian or scholar, lay or cleric, to write a book on this subject, to examine the existing English versions, Catholic and Protestant, to weigh them in the critical balance, and, whenever he finds them wanting, to propose what he thinks a better, more accurate rendering, whether it be for a verse or a chapter, or even whole books of the sacred volume. And when this is done in a proper spirit, with due reverence to Church authority, and not overstepping the bounds of honest criticism, the Church, far from being displeased, will lend her encouragement, as she does with all reasonable endeavors to illustrate the meaning of God's Word. But this is within the domain of science; the book is intended for scholars and men of learning. The Church does not wish such investigation pushed out of its legitimate sphere; she does not wish these changes circulated among the ignorant and unstable crowd, lest it should have the effect of unsettling their minds, and diminishing in them the reverence they have hitherto cherished for God's Holy Word. Hence she never will allow that by the side of her authorized version, these changes and improvements (real or imaginary) should be introduced into the liturgy, or into the prayer-books, or manuals of devotion. For all these the Church has always insisted on one uniform text, stamped with the seal of ecclesiastical authority. And this is precisely what we object to in the little volume before us. Changes that may be innocent or praise-worthy in a book of science, are wholly out of place in books intended for private, or still worse for public devotion. And this Little Office, we know, is recited not only in the closet by individuals, but publicly in churches and oratories by sodalities and confraternities. The American Church has spoken her mind plainly enough by declaring that the Douay must absolutely be adhered to, "omnino retineatur" (Conc. Balt. Plen., Tit. I., Cap. III., § 16). It is therefore against the spirit of our Church law, to say the least, to use in books for private or public prayer any other English version than the Douay.

"LIVES OF THE SAINTS, compiled from authentic sources, with a practical Instruction on the Life of each Saint for every day in the year. By *Rev. F. X. Weniger*, D. D., S. J. Permissu Superiorum. New York: P. O'Shea, publisher. 1875. Parts I.—IV."

There is no better exponent of the doctrine of the Catholic Church than the lives of her Saints. Here is seen how she acts out in practice, whatever she believes and teaches. Many a pagan sage delivered wholesome moral precepts to his disciples; but they were only pompous words, never reduced to practice by master or scholar. But with the Church of God it is otherwise. The Holy Spirit, whose perpetual presence was promised her, not only puts words of truth upon her lips, but maintains ever burning in her heart the flame of divine charity. Hence as she teaches, so she lives. If we would convert those who are outside of her communion, it is more necessary—and far more difficult—to bend their will, than to convince their understanding. Many a one who will readily yield to the reasonings of a Bellarmine, a Milner, a Wiseman or an England, and confess himself unable to answer their arguments, is not thereby always conquered; but will remain, tormented by remorse, in the false communion to which he belongs, until at last, perhaps, the daily life and actions of some Catholic, of which he happens to be witness, appeal silently but irresistibly to his heart, and bring about the happy result, which controversy never could accomplish. Many a proud patrician of Pagan Rome, as we are told by St. Chrysostom, owed his conversion to the holy life, he was forced to admire and venerate in the slaves of his household. And that, which is effected by the force of single examples gathered from the experience of daily life, must also be the natural consequence of holiness attested by history—not the holy life of one individual, but the collected biographies of all those great Saints, who, in every age, have filled the Church with the sweet perfume of their holiness. These are the books that Catholics should prefer to put into the hands of well-disposed or inquiring friends.

But it is not only, or principally, for the benefit of those outside the fold, that such books are written and published. They are meant not only to glorify God, who "is wonderful in His Saints," but also to furnish us Catholics with examples of virtue, borrowed from those who are of the same earthly mould, that will encourage us, and, if need be, shame us into serving God and saving our souls. The very Saints themselves were often led to renounce the world and begin their sanctity by reading and reflecting on the holy deeds of the Saints who went before them. This was the beginning of conversion and perfect life for an Ignatius, a John Colombini, and others. Even the great St. Augustine was released from his inward struggles and spiritual bondage, and called to "walk in newness of life" by the short, pithy argument which he puts into the mouth of that "venerable matron, Chastity, in whose train walked countless hosts of young men and maidens." TU NON POTERIS, QUOD ISTI QUOD ISTÆ?

Father Weniger has done the Catholic public a real service by the compilation of these Lives, which he had (as we learn from the Preface) previously published in German. The reflections appended to each day are highly appropriate; they draw out for practical use, whatever is most striking in the virtues of the Saint, or the incidents of his life. Their moderate length, besides, is such as to make each Life just matter enough for one day's private or family reading. The Lives are well printed, and handsomely illustrated, and we sincerely hope they may obtain the circulation that they deserve.

CEREMONIAL FOR THE USE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCHES IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. Originally Published by Order of the First Council of Baltimore. Fourth Edition. Baltimore: Kelly, Piet & Co., 1875.

The ceremonies of the Church are not mere forms. They are forms, but forms full of real significance. In other words, they are the expression and external representation of spiritual realities. This is true, even of their minutest details. Each act, and movement, and posture, however unimportant in itself it may seem to be, expresses or symbolizes some spiritual truth. Apart, too, from the special meaning of each detail of the ceremonies, they are, all of them, important, as fulfilling the injunctions of Sacred Scripture: "Adore the Lord in holy becomingness:" "Let all things be done decently, and according to order."

On these accounts it is necessary that priests especially, and those who assist them in the services of the Church, should be perfectly familiar with the ceremonies, so as to perform them with the exactness, with which they ought to be performed, both as reverential acts to God, and for the sake of inspiring respect and devotion in the faithful. For—as is well remarked in the preface to the work we are noticing—"if Ecclesiastics are not well versed in the ceremonies of any sacred rite, the impression produced is far from being religious or edifying, and the intention of the Church is, in this respect, frustrated. As a rule, too little attention is paid to certain ceremonies which are esteemed by some as of such slight importance as not to merit care in their preparation. . . . Let the young Levites, then, be well grounded in ceremonies during their Seminary career; let them convince themselves that by zeal and fidelity to the prescriptions of the Rubrics, they are contributing to the 'decency' and, order, of Divine Service, and let them remember that a trifling carelessness in trifling matters, once acquired, easily and surely leads to a disregard of important Rubrics."

In the present edition of the Ceremonial, the arrangement of subjects is the same as in former editions. Some corrections of the former editions have been made, mainly "referring to the ceremonies connected with Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, the Forty Hours' Devotion, and some few regarding High Mass." An appendix has been added on the "Defects which occur in the celebration of Mass." The revision and correction of this edition has been carefully performed by the Right Rev. Dr. Becker, Bishop of Wilmington; and it is published with the approval of the Most Rev. J. Roosevelt Bayley, Archbishop of Baltimore.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF PAUL SEIGNERET, (Seminarist of Saint Sulpice,) shot at Belleville, Paris, May 26th, 1871. Translated from the French of the Second Edition, by *N. R.* New York: P. O'Shea, 37 Barclay St, 1875.

Nothing better exemplifies the strides which Catholic literature is making, than the number of books which any one topic now elicits from the press. Here we have an additional work, in part suggested by the sad days of the Commune.

This book, one of Mr. O'Shea's latest, is, as the preface partially hints, a "heart-study." As such it admirably suits our day and its wants, where sentiment is dying out, and mere availability made the test of worth. The author of this book is correct in saying that Seigneret's Life and Letters will prove of great service to young men preparing themselves for the sacred ministry. Here they will learn, what was so admirably taught by the recluse of Soreze, that the priesthood is a state where men will do good and be appreciated in proportion to "the spirit of sacrifice they manifest." This is also a work well suited to the wants of young people, who have not yet learned that the Church in 1875 produces as rare fruit as in the earliest ages of her existence. In it will also be found another very important lesson, that parents have in their own hands, to a great extent, the future of their children.

We cannot enter into the details which this book calls for. It would be unjust to attempt even an analysis of its minor parts. Throughout, it is so full of deep thought and heartfelt convictions, that we must ask every one of our readers to enjoy the satisfaction and to feel the edification, we have experienced by procuring this book. Herein they will learn of the heart and the soul of that noble youth, who "stepped forward and modestly took his place in the ranks of the doomed," when called by the brigadier Romain.

It is sad to think how men, frenzied with hatred of the God who made them, could thus torture His servants; but let us console ourselves with the thought that "the ball which pierced his heart, and gave him his death blow," was the means chosen by an all-wise Providence to add another to the noble band in heaven, who are allowed to bear the palm in their hands.

Before concluding we cannot help remarking that the Rev. Fathers of St. Sulpice in America and Europe could do no better work than to put in volumes, such as that we are reviewing, edifying accounts of their most noted seminarians Such works would be a blessing, and might be appropriately called "Gems of St. Sulpice."

Rituale Romanum, Pauli V. Pontificis jussu editum et a Benedicto XIV. auctum et castigatum;—cui novissima accedit Benedictionum et Instructionum Appendix. Baltimori. Excudebat Joannes Murphy. Summi Pontificis atque Archiepiscopi Baltimorensis Typographus. 1874. 8vo. Pp. 546. Red and black.

This is a handsomely-printed edition of the Roman Ritual, issued with the *imprimatur* of Archbishop Bayley, which should be of itself sufficient recommendation. It is, indeed, a treasure-house for the clergy, containing, as it does, not only all that a priest needs for the solemn administration of the Sacraments, for funerals, etc., but also an immense number of Formulas of Blessings for every occasion, all approved by authority. To mention only one point out of many, it amply supplies a want, which was often seriously felt in using the Ritual hitherto current amongst us. We allude to many prayers, versicles, Psalms and Gospels, that have been restored to their proper place in the chapter "De Visitatione et cura infirmorum." How often had a priest to regret their absence in former Rituals, especially when having to pay frequent visits to the same sick person. The print and execution of the book are beautiful, and every way worthy of the honored veteran amongst our Catholic publishers, who has done so much to promote the cause of Catholic literature in this country. A good deal of fault has been found, we are told, with a typographical error of omission in the first impressions. This was as unreasonable as it was unnecessary. Mr. Murphy was no more to blame in the matter, than this Review, which was not then in existence. He modelled his edition after a copy, which it would have been presumption in him or any one else to suppose incorrect. But, whatever may have been the extent of the error, it was instantly remedied; and the edition, as it now stands, need fear no criticism. Others have objected to the bulk of the book. But if it was to hold its contents—so rich and varied, so desirable for the clergy—we do not well see how this could have been avoided. Perhaps a remedy may be found in an abridged edition. The present magnificent volume may be used for the Vestry-Room, and for solemn occasions; while the abridged copy—omitting whatever concerns Processions, Blessings that are of rare occurrence or require special faculties; but retaining (we would add) the many beautiful prayers for the sick—would be a lighter burden for the priest, who has to trudge miles perhaps on foot, day and night, in fair and foul weather, to assist in life and death the scattered members of his flock.

MISCELLANEA: comprising Reviews, Lectures and Essays on Historical, Theological and Miscellaneous subjects. By *M. J. Spalding*, D. D., Archbishop of Baltimore. Sixth Edition, revised and greatly enlarged. Baltimore: Published by John Murphy and Co. 1875. Two vols. in one. 8vo. Pp. 865.

THE HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION in Germany and Switzerland, and in England, Ireland, Scotland, the Netherlands, France and Northern Europe. In a series of Essays, reviewing D'Aubignè, Menzel, Hallem, etc. By *M. J. Spalding*, D. D., Archbishop of Baltimore. Seventh edition, revised and enlarged. Baltimore, (John Murphy & Co.,) 1876. 8vo.; Two Vols. in one.

THE EVIDENCES OF CATHOLICITY: A series of Lectures delivered in the Cathedral of Louisville (Ky.) By *M. J. Spalding*, Archbishop of Baltimore. Sixth edition, revised and enlarged. With an Appendix. Baltimore (John Murphy & Co.), 1876.

These are three well-known books from the indefatigable pen of the late Archbishop Spalding. What gives the new editions a special value, is that they have received their last touch from his own hand. He was about to prepare an edition of his Collected Works, when surprised by his fatal illness. But the corrections and additions, from his pen, are given in these volumes. The "Evidences of Catholicity" treats of a theme "ever ancient and ever new;" and the Archbishop handles it in his own sturdy, vigorous style. The "History of the Protestant Reformation" brings to light, with unsparing hand, those disgraceful outbreaks of human passion and wickedness in which the Reformation had its beginning, found its development, and without which, as candid Protestants, like Hallam, are not ashamed to acknowledge, it never could have obtained its success. The witnesses alleged by the Archbishop are generally, nay, almost exclusively, the Reformers themselves, and their disciples and adherents. Yet there are men who laugh to scorn the miracles of the Church in ancient or modern ages, and can swallow without a murmur the prodigious notion, that this subversion of the old religion, this revolution, engendered in sin and propagated through blood and crime, was the work of Him, whose special attribute of Holiness is day and night, the unceasing song of the Angelic host in heaven!

The "MISCELLANEA" is mainly composed of essays, which owed their origin to the anti-Catholic movement of twenty years ago. Their republication at this time cannot be considered inopportune, since fanatics and knaves, of high and low degree, are seeking once more to enkindles the fires of civil discord, and to make of sectarian prejudice a stepping-stone to place and political power.

THE ADVENTURES OF A PROTESTANT IN SEARCH OF A RELIGION. By *Iota.* New York: D. &J. Sadlier & Co., 31 Barclay Street. Montreal: No. 275 Notre Dame Street. 1874.

"Iota," in common with many converts, feels it a duty not only to rejoice in the gift of faith which he has received, but, likewise, to publish a work, in which the strength of argument and attractiveness of style will induce other wanderers to enter that One Fold.

That "Iota" has talent none can deny who will, as we have done, patiently read his book from cover to cover. Yet, we feel constrained to say that our author's chief strength would be better shown in short, sketchy articles, published in magazine form, than in a book of several hundred pages, such as he has written.* "Iota's" attempts at analysis of character generally fail; when he limits himself to the mere sketch of what he has seen various ministers doing in the way of "Pastoral work," his success is complete. The title: "*Adventures* in search of *a* religion" is open to serious criticism; his dedication is likewise broken in its idea; yet, those who will read the first chapter and the second, will agree with us that Iota need but submit his future efforts to some impartial critic *before* publication, and they will prove even more attractive than the "Adventures." In a future edition, the curtailing of the "diary" of Master —— would be an improvement. The sentiments attributed to the youth are forced and exaggerated. With the exceptions above taken, we can cheerfully recommend Iota's "Adventures," as a valuable addition to the Catholic literature of this class.

---

* As proof of what we assert, we wish space permitted us to re-publish here Iota's description of the "dapper little budding pastor, in a neat white tie, spruce cassock waistcoat, and a solemn and decidedly professional black bag," and his experience when he had the misfortune to select his text from one of the Gospels, instead of from one of the more Deuteronomian parts of the Holy Scriptures. This would, indeed, afford amusement to our readers. A critic, however, must forego these pleasures. Readers, who desire the amusement we have enjoyed, must get Iota's "Adventures."

GRADUALE DE TEMPORE ET DE SANCTIS, Juxta Ritum Sacrosanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cum Cantu, Pauli V. Pont. Max. Jussu Reformato, Cui Addita Sunt Officia Postea Approbata. Sub Auspiciis Santissimi Domini Nostri Pii P. P. IX. Curanti Sacr. Rituum Congregatione, Cum Privilegio. Ratisbonœ, Neo. Eboraci & Cincinnati. Sumptibus, chartis et typis Friderici Pustet. S. Sedis Apost. et Sacr. Rituum Congregationis Typographi. MDCCCLXXI.

VESPERALE ROMANUM, juxta ordinem Breviarii Romani, cum cantu emendato, editum sub auspiciis Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Pii P. P. IX. curanti Sacr. Rituum Congregatione cum privilegio. MDCCCLXXV. Ratisbonœ, Neo. Eboraci et Cincinnati, sumpti bus etc. Friderici Pustet, etc.

These volumes were prepared under the supervision of a committee appointed by the Sacred Congregation of Rites. They are published with the approbation of the same Congregation, and are strongly recommended to all Ordinaries, by our Holy Father Pius IX. These are the highest recommendations that can be given to works of the kind. The notation in these volumes has been arranged in strict accordance with the Roman system. At this the Holy Father expresses great gratification, as he is most anxious to see the liturgy everywhere in this, as in all other respects, conform to Roman usage. Great efforts are now being made in Europe, to revive genuine Gregorian music, in the churches; and, if we are to believe the newspapers, these efforts have been already attended with signal success. As to what has been done in this direction in the United States we can speak only for our own diocese. We don't think there is even in Rome, a choir where the Gregorian Chant is rendered with more precision and effect, than in that of our dioscesan seminary. For this we are indebted to the present accomplished professor of music in that institution, whose careful learning and long residence in the Eternal City, enabled him to introduce here not only the correct Roman chant, but the Roman style of execution also, which is and can be only traditional.

MADAME DE LAVELLE'S BEQUEST: COUNSELS TO YOUNG LADIES WHO HAVE COMPLETED THEIR EDUCATION. Translated from the Fourth French Edition, by a *Sister of St Joseph*. Philadelphia: Peter F. Cunningham & Son, 29 South 10th Street. 1875.

She, who translated from the French these admirable "Counsels"—Mother St. John, late Superior of the Sisters of St. Joseph—in life most highly esteemed, and in death deeply lamented—is now, we trust, receiving in heaven a rich reward for her many arduous labors of charity, done in despite of great and long-continued bodily weakness and pain, accepted with cheerfulness and endured with exemplary patience. Notwithstanding her sufferings, often amounting to agony, she discharged efficiently and faithfully the duties of her office as Superior, and also found time to translate from the French into English many excellent religious books. Of these "Madame de Lavelle's Bequest" is one.

The Right Rev. Bishop of Valence, in his approval of the second French edition, says: "We rejoice at the success obtained by this book, inspired by true piety and tender affection for youth, in which the lessons of experience are exposed with talent, and in a simple and attractive style. We again recommend it as a book most interesting, and well calculated to form young ladies to virtue."

The work is divided into four parts, viz: I. Duties to God; II. Duties of Young Ladies to their Families; III. Duties of Young Ladies outside of their Families; IV. Counsels on different subjects. Under these general heads a multitude of topics are discussed in a practical way, and young ladies are shown how to conduct themselves, so as to guard against mistakes and temptations, and to discharge their duties. Almost every relation and circumstance in which young ladies can be placed is touched upon, and the counsels given in regard to them are sound and judicious.

GENTILISM: Religion previous to Christianity. By *Rev. Aug. J. Thebaud, S. J.* New York: D. & J. Sadlier & Co. 1876. 8vo. pp. 525.

As this volume has been made the subject of an article in the present number, nothing more need be said of it here. We will only venture to make one assertion, of the truth of which we feel quite sure. Had a book on this same subject, though with a contrary purpose, been written by any of the worshipers of modern science, "falsely so called," and had it been written with one-half, aye one-tenth of the logic and learning that pervade Father Thebaud's volume, their partisan press would everywhere be filled with enthusiastic, even extravagant praise of its contents. Father Thebaud will have to content himself with the applause of only a few, perhaps; but they are impartial men, lovers of truth as well as of science; and their judgment far outweighs the plaudits of men, who, like the encyclopedists and their crew of infidel adherents, have conspired to puff any and everything, provided it be irreligious. They will see and admire how completely the distinguished author has proved his point against the evolutionists viz: that Man, historically considered, since his appearance on earth, has not been progressing, but going backward, falling off gradually from what he was in the glory of his beginning; and that this process of deterioration went on steadily until four thousand years ago, and was only arrested by the coming into the world of Christ our Lord and the regenerating spirit of His religion.

"NEW PRACTICAL MEDITATIONS, for every day in the year, on the life of our Lord Jesus Christ, chiefly intended for the use of religious communities. By the *Rev. Father Bruno Vercruysse, S. J.* Enriched by several Novenas and Octaves. . . . . Exercises preparatory to the Renewal of Vows, and for a Retreat of Eight Days, etc. New York and Cincinnati: Benziger Brothers."

We don't profess to have a very extended knowledge of meditation books, but this we consider one of the best we have ever seen. The great objection to books of this kind, is, that the meditations are too long. They are meditations made, not to be made. They either contain too much matter to be digested in half an hour, or even in an hour, or too little, diluted, however, in any amount of verbage. They may do very well as spiritual reading; but they do not necessitate, or invite the mental exercise involved in meditation, properly so called. Father Vercruysse's meditations are short, pithy and suggestive. His "Considerations" are always interesting and instructive; his "Applications," appropriate; and his "Affections" spring naturally from the subject matter. To write a series of really good meditations, a man needs something more than a mere general knowledge of ascetic theology. He must be well posted in dogmatic theology, also; and in biblical hermeneutics. The book before us gives undoubted evidence of such a training on the part of its author. The learning that underlies its simple style, the good sense and the good taste displayed on its every page, and the writer's intimate acquaintance with the duties, and the wants of Religious, will make it an invaluable acquisition to Religious communities of men, and of women, for whose use it was specially written.

"SIN AND ITS CONSEQUENCES. By His Eminence, *Henry Edward Manning*, Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Third edition. New York: D. & J. Sadlier & Company, 31 Barclay street. Montreal: 275 Notre Dame street."

This volume contains eight Lenten sermons by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, when, or where delivered, we have no means of knowing. The mere statement that they are his sermons is higher praise of them than any other words of ours could convey. They may be thought to be on a trite subject; but no subject can remain trite when his research, and brilliant imagination, and graceful pen are brought to its elucidation. In these sermons, or, we should, perhaps, rather say, lectures, what was old and familiar, and, as some might think, common-place, becomes fresh and new and of absorbing interest. So much so, that few, we think, who will take them up, will be able to lay them down without finishing them, and returning again and again to dwell on some of the exquisite passages they contain. They are at once profound and brilliant, learned and popular. They carry with them the weight of theological lore and the charm of true oratory. They will be read with deep interest by persons of all classes, and they will serve as models of style to such of our young preachers as desire to rise, in their compositions, to the level of the most cultivated taste of the present day.

LINGARD'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND ABRIDGED: With a continuation from 1688 to 1854. By *James Burke, Esq., A. B.*, and an Appendix to 1873, by the editor of the First Class Book of History: the whole preceded by a Memoir of Dr. Lingard, and Marginal Notes by M. D. Kerney, A. M. Third revised and enlarged edition. Baltimore: Published by John Murphy & Co.: 1875. 8vo., pp. 688.

Of Lingard it is unnecessary to say a word. His impartial history has stood the test of time and the most searching criticism. Mr. Burke's Abridgement has met, and deservedly, with great favor both in Great Britain and in this country. We owe our thanks to the writer of the Appendix for his interesting summary of events between 1854 and 1873; and especially for the good taste and impartiality with which he narrates certain facts of domestic history, which so few seem able to handle without showing their partizan feelings. In his brief but solid pages one finds none, we need not say, of the venomous rancour, and none even of the hollow, canting phrases, with which it is displayed by some or disguised by other writers of text-books that circulate over a great part of the country.

NEW MANUAL OF THE SACRED HEART. Compiled and translated from approved sources. Baltimore: Kelly, Piet & Co. (With the imprimatur of the Most Reverend Archbishop.)

THE LITTLE COMPANION OF THE SISTERS OF MERCY. Baltimore: Kelly, Piet & Co. 1875.

These are two handsome little books of devotion. They are prayer-books in fact; but in the former, devotion to the Sacred Heart colors all the pious exercises, ordinary or extraordinary, such as hearing Mass, morning and night prayers, approaching the sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist, etc. The latter has special reference to the daily life of a Sister of Mercy. It contains many indulgenced prayers, some of which, we see, have been versified. This may not be always safe; though, as Father St. John remarks in the Preface to his English Raccolta, Rome, seems in these matters, to tolerate a good deal of liberty on the part of translators.

THE DEVOTION TO THE HEART OF JESUS. With an introduction on the history of Jansenism. By *John Bernard Dalgairns,* Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. New revised edition. Baltimore: Kelly, Piet & Co. 1875.

The devotion to the Sacred Heart seems to be growing all over the world from day to day. This little treatise of Father Delgairns is admirably adapted for its end. He wrote it principally for converts; but it will answer well, likewise, the needs of many born Catholics, who do not understand the devotion, and would be puzzled to explain or defend it, if questioned by their Protestant friends. It is written with eloquence, and at the same time is full of fervor and unction. The sketch of Jansenism at the beginning is graphic and most interesting, and would itself be worth twice the price of this beautiful little volume.

PERIODICAL

70734

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

DOES NOT CIRCULATE